

Jesus' Cry from the Cross

*Towards a First-Century Understanding of the Intertextual
Relationship Between Psalm 22 and the Narrative of Mark's Gospel*

Holly J. Carey

**Ph.D. in New Testament and Christian Origins
The University of Edinburgh
2007**

I hereby declare, in fulfilment of Regulation 2.5 of the University of Edinburgh Postgraduate Student Handbook concerning the submission of a thesis, that:

I have composed the following thesis, that it is my own work, and that it has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Holly J. Carey

Abstract

The meaning of the Markan Jesus' citation of Psalm 22:2 has long been a matter of debate amongst scholars in the field. More specifically, this debate centers on whether the citation is atomistic or contextual. In an effort both to join and move forward the dialogue on this subject, the primary question of this thesis is: How would Jesus' cry from the cross of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 have been understood by Mark's first-century readers given its context in the entire narrative of the gospel? The contribution of this thesis is in its multi-level approach to the above question by the examination of a variety of evidence that, in the end, indicates that Mark's earliest readers would have read and understood this psalmic citation as contextual. It is argued that, *contra* the opinion of the majority of Markan scholarship, a contextual reading of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 does not serve to negate or dilute the presentation of Jesus as one in distress and agony, but rather enhances this aspect of his death by underscoring his identity as a Righteous Sufferer who experiences suffering but has the promise of vindication. Among the evidence that supports a contextual reading of the citation in the Markan narrative is, (a) the importance of Jesus' impending resurrection/vindication and its foreshadowing in the Markan narrative; (b) the relatively consistent contextual use of the scriptures in the narrative prior to Mark 15:34; (c) the patterns of the textual and liturgical use of the psalms and the presence of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer in Mark's socio-cultural milieu; (d) the Markan presentation of Jesus as the Righteous Sufferer throughout the narrative; and (e) an exegesis of Mark 15:34 and the surrounding Markan passion-resurrection narrative with regard to the function of Ps 22 in the story of Jesus' death and resurrection. A test case of the argument presented in the previous chapters of the thesis is undertaken at the close of the study, when both Matthew and Luke's treatment of Ps 22 and other Righteous Sufferer language is considered, regarding their readings of Ps 22 in Mark as the earliest tangible evidence of the interpretation of the use of Ps 22 in his gospel.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: *Setting the Scene: Mark 15:34 in the Current Debate*

Introduction	1
History of Interpretation	6
The Use of the Scriptures in the NT	7
The Use of the Scriptures in Mark	10
Psalm 22:2 in Mark	14
The Contributions of this Study and Its Approach	25
The Trajectory of this Study	29
Assumptions and Limitations of this Study	30

Chapter 2: *Intertextuality, Citation, and Allusion*

Introduction	32
Intertextuality in Literary Criticism and Biblical Studies	32
Allusion in Literary Criticism and Biblical Studies	40

Chapter 3: *Suffering, Death, and Vindication: The Importance of Resurrection in Mark's Gospel*

Introduction	50
The Formal Passion-Resurrection Predictions	51
The Markan "Passion Predictions": A Misnomer?	51
Mark 8:31	54
Mark 9:31	59
Mark 10:33-34	62
Other Foreshadowing of Jesus' Suffering, Death, and Resurrection	65
Conclusion: The Importance of Jesus' Resurrection in Mark's Gospel	76

Chapter 4: Citation of and Allusion to the Scriptures in Mark's Gospel

Introduction	78
Mark 1:2-3 (Mal 3:1; Exod 23:20; Isa 40:3)	79
Mark 5:1-20 (Exod 14:21-15:21)	84
Mark 5:22-24, 35-45 (1 Kgs 17:17-24; 2 Kgs 4:32-37)	86
Mark 8:17, 18 (Jer 5:21; Exod 4:21; 7:3; 14:4, 7; Ps 95:8; Isa 63:17)	88
Mark 11:17 (Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11)	90
Mark 12:1-12 (Isa 5:1-2; Ps 118:22-23)	92
Mark 14:18 (Ps 41:10)	96
Mark 15:36 (Ps 69:22)	98
Analysis of Results	100
Conclusions	103

Chapter 5: The Socio-Cultural Context of Mark's Gospel: The Motif of the Righteous Sufferer and the Use of Psalms in the First Century

Introduction	105
Is There a Motif of the Righteous Sufferer?	106
The Righteous Sufferer in the Scriptures and Extra-Canonical Literature	108
The Righteous Sufferer at Qumran	113
Using Texts in the First Century	117
Incipits	118
The Liturgical Use of the Psalms	124
The Textual Use of Psalm 22	129
Wisdom of Solomon 2 and 5	130
<i>Odes of Solomon</i>	132
<i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>	134
The <i>Hodayot</i> of the Qumran Community	135
Analysis of Results	139
Conclusions	140

Chapter 6: *Jesus as Mark's Righteous Sufferer*

Introduction	142
The Righteous Sufferer in the Larger Markan Narrative	143
The Righteous Sufferer in Mark's Passion-Resurrection Narrative	150
LXX Ps 21: A Psalm of the Righteous Sufferer?	154
Conclusions	160

Chapter 7: *The Meaning and Function of Ps 22 in Mark's Passion-Resurrection Narrative*

Introduction	162
Strong Allusions to Ps 22 in Mark's Passion-Resurrection Narrative	163
Fainter Allusions to Ps 22 in Mark's Larger Narrative	166
Fainter Allusions to Ps 22 in Mark's Passion-Resurrection Narrative	171
The Language of Mark 15:34	175
Only Ps 22:2?	181
Interpreting Mark 15:34 in Light of Ps 22: Some Other Approaches	183
Mark 15:34 in Its Narrative Context	186
Mark 15:34 and Psalm 22	190
Mark 15:34 and 15:37	192
Why <i>Ps 22</i> ?	194

Chapter 8: *Conclusions (Chapters 3-7)* 198

Chapter 9: *Matthew and Luke: Early Readers of Mark's Gospel*

Introduction	204
Test Case: Matthew, Mark, and Ps 22	207
Test Case: Luke, Mark, and Ps 22	211
Conclusions	215

Appendix A: <i>MT Psalm 22</i>	218
Appendix B: <i>LXX Psalm 21</i>	222
Works Cited	227

Chapter 1

Setting the Scene: Mark 15:34 in the Current Debate

Introduction

Throughout the centuries there have been a variety of interpretations regarding the meaning of Jesus' lament in Mark 15:34, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" (NRSV).¹ This diversity has resulted in varying theological assertions concerning Jesus' incarnation,² the nature of the Trinity,³ and the function of Jesus' death, i.e. atonement theologies⁴ and the like, a fact which underscores the importance of this passage for understanding the nature of Jesus' life and death. It is clear that Mark is portraying Jesus as one who bemoans his state of affairs at the moment immediately prior to his death, but is it true that this is an indication that he is experiencing utter *abandonment* by God? Or is this a cry of despair uttered as a result of his pain and suffering, i.e. an expression of his total helplessness at the moment of his death? These are just two of the ways to read the Markan Jesus' perplexing statement in this passage.

¹ All abbreviations used in this study follow *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (eds. P. H. Alexander, et al; Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1999).

² Ambrose, *Of the Christian Faith* (NPNF 2; 10:230), argued that it is the human soul of Jesus that doubts, not his divine nature: "As God he was not distressed, but as a human he was capable of being distressed. It was not as God he died, but as man." He believed that Jesus' words on the cross indicate that he bore our (humanity's) terrors. In arguing against the Christian belief that Jesus was divine, the pagan Celsus (see Origen's *Contra Celsum* 2.5-2.55) regards the manner in which Jesus dies (e. g., his cry from the cross as he died, *Cels.* 2.55) as an indication that he was merely human. See Loveday Alexander, "The Four Among Pagans," in *The Written Gospel* (eds. M. Bockmuehl and D. Hagner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 222-37, for a helpful introduction to Celsus' antagonism toward the gospel.

³ E. g., Leon Morris, *The Cross in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 49; and William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark* (New London Commentary on the New Testament; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1974), 573, whose wording on the subject (for example, "separation" and "alienation") raises questions concerning the Trinity which he fails to address. See Georg Braumann, "Wozu (Mk 15:34)," in *Theokratia: Jahrbuch des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum II 1970-1972, Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorff zum 70* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 155-65, for a summary of early German commentaries that address this issue.

⁴ Such as the view that Jesus took on the sins of the world while on the cross (see footnote 5). Although this passage does not portray a Markan atonement theology, those who hold to this type of reading may be importing a *Pauline* atonement theology (cf. 2 Cor 5:21; Gal 3:13).

The fact that the Markan Jesus is quoting Ps 22:2⁵ here is not in debate. The more important questions for this study are: *Why* does Mark have Jesus quote this verse just moments before his death, and *how* would first-century readers have read and interpreted it in light of its place in Mark's narrative? To put the thesis question another way: *How would Jesus' cry from the cross in Mark 15:34 have been understood by Mark's first-century readers given its context in the entire narrative of the gospel?* Given the focus of this study on a narrative reading of Mark, questions concerning historical Jesus matters (What did Jesus really say on the cross? Did Jesus actually quote the entire psalm?) and form-critical or redaction-critical issues will not be of concern here.

Some believe Jesus' words here indicate that he has truly been abandoned by God, rejected by him because he has taken on or become the sins of the world.⁶ Others also read this lament as an indication of abandonment, arguing that Jesus' extreme suffering is the author's singular focus here. These interpretations rely on an atomistic reading of the psalmic citation, ignoring the impact that the context of the original lament (Ps 22) may have on this occurrence of the lament from the mouth of the dying Jesus. On the other hand, other scholars believe Jesus' words to point toward the whole psalm, indicating that his (Jesus') thoughts are not only on his distress, but also on the deliverance that comes to the psalmist at the end of the psalm.⁷

The debate swirls around whether or not one should read in Jesus' cry of Ps 22:2 a reference to the original context of Ps 22, which narrates the sufferings of an anonymous pious man at the hands of his enemies and concludes with his vindication

⁵ Psalm versification in this study follows the MT and LXX translations. I will refer to the psalm as "Ps 22" for two reasons: (1) it is not certain that Mark is using the LXX as his source for the citation or Greek translation (see my discussion of this issue in Chapter 6); and (2) the psalm itself is most often referred to as "Ps 22" in both academic and ecclesial settings.

⁶ E. g., Ernest Best, *The Temptation and the Passion* (2d ed; SNTSMS 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), lxiv-lxviii; Lane, *Gospel*, 572-73; and Augustine, *Letters of St. Augustine*, 140 to Honoratus 5 (FC 20:68). Morton S. Enslin, *The Prophet from Nazareth* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), 208, asserts that Jesus' despair comes because his confidence has collapsed due to the fact that he has failed God and God has failed him. However, Enslin's point is merely an assertion, containing no argument or explanation as to why he interprets Jesus' words in this manner.

⁷ Allan Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel: A Historical Study of the Gospel According to Mark, with a Text and English Version* (New York: Macmillan, 1901), 280-81, is one example of several scholars who seek to understand the meaning of Mark 15:34 from the standpoint of the historical Jesus.

by Yahweh and his subsequent praise to God in the presence of his community. In this study I will refer to the type of reading which embraces the original context of the psalm as a *contextual reading* of the psalmic citation of Mark 15:34. The alternative reading, which does not allow the larger context of the psalm to influence the interpretation of Mark 15:34, will be referred to as “atomistic.” This term is not used pejoratively; it is, in fact, often used by those who support this type of reading intertexts.⁸ It merely indicates that the portion of the psalm actually cited (Ps 22:2) is the only portion of the passage that is relevant for interpretation in its new context (Mark 15:34).

An interesting (and disappointing) aspect of this debate is that it is not really a debate after all! On the whole, most of the advocates of either side tend to dismiss the other argument with what amounts to either, (a) an assumption that their view is correct; or (b) one or two lines of defense of their position, with little evidence to support it. Those who advocate an atomistic reading of Ps 22:2 in Mark’s passion narrative often accuse those who read it contextually of simply wanting to explain away the difficulties of the notion that Jesus suffered and was abandoned by God. We might imagine that the former would diagnose the latter with a severe case of “happy-ending syndrome”! On the other hand, those who believe that the whole context of Ps 22 should be used to interpret Mark 15:34 often fail to argue the case, defaulting to the standard “It is known that the ancients would cite the first line of a psalm or text in order to convey the meaning of the whole,” or something to that effect. There are very few works that give significant attention to this issue with regard to Mark. The rationale for appealing to the whole psalm must be established before an examination of its function within Mark’s passion narrative can take place. One could argue that if this was the design of the author (to point to the entire psalm), then this is an odd way of going about it, since this is the “least suitable verse” in Ps 22 to use as a pointer toward future deliverance.⁹ Why should one consult the whole when only the first line is cited? Is this how Mark’s first-century readers would have read or heard it?

⁸ E. g., Donald Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 21, 56-57.

⁹ For example, A. M. Hunter, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (TBC; London: SCM Press, 1948), 144, provides this type of argument.

As mentioned above, it has often been a complaint that those who read Mark 15:34 with the whole context of Ps 22 in view are ignoring the verses' own meaning while underscoring the "happy ending" at the conclusion of the psalm.¹⁰ R. Gundry argues that the possibility that Jesus' citation is an indication of confidence in the deliverance of which Ps 22:23-32 speaks is weakened by the fact that there are instances throughout the gospels where citations are made from the middle of scriptural passages.¹¹ He believes the despairing cry in Ps 22:2 to be a "singularly inapt pointer" to the confidence that is found in the latter part of the psalm. In a similar argument, R. France is convinced that reading the exegesis of the whole psalm into the few words of Jesus is to undermine the effect that Mark intended, which was one of extreme agony.¹² M. Hooker sees in this reading an attempt to hide the horror that is conveyed in the crucifixion scene, and finds no evidence that Mark had the rest of the psalm in mind at this point in the narrative.¹³ Although there are those who advocate a contextual reading of the psalmic citation precisely for this purpose, this desire to "water down" the suffering of Jesus does not have to be the necessary motivation or result of this view.¹⁴

In this study, I will argue that the dichotomy between these two "camps" does not have to exist. Even further I would argue that to take one against the other would be to miss the point of the narrative here.¹⁵ It cannot be denied that the Markan Jesus experienced profound suffering and distress. Mark provides additional indications in his passion narrative that Jesus is in distress, both at the anticipation of and during his suffering.¹⁶ Even if one took out this citation altogether, it is quite clear that Jesus

¹⁰ Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), 272.

¹¹ Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1993), 966.

¹² R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002), 652-53.

¹³ Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (BNTC 2; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 376.

¹⁴ See Gundry, *Apology*, 966, for a list of those scholars who attempt to deny the despair of Jesus on the cross.

¹⁵ Along with Larry W. Hurtado, *Mark* (NIBCNT; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1983), 267.

¹⁶ See Reinhard Feldmeier, *Die Krisis des Gottessohnes: Die Gethsemaneerzählung als Schlüssel der Markuspasion* (WUNT 2:21; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987), regarding Jesus' prayer in the garden of Gethsemane (Mark 14:32-42). Jesus' "loud cry" at his death (Mark 15:37) may also indicate his suffering.

experienced suffering and agony at the hands of his persecutors. Reading Jesus' citation of Ps 22:2 with the rest of the psalm's context need not *subtract* from the sense of Jesus' distress, but rather can *enhance* it by guiding the reader to identify him with the Righteous Sufferer of the psalm.

The suffering of the protagonist of Ps 22 is not in doubt. The psalm elaborates on the injustice of his predicament, his pain, his shame, and his distress. Mark identifies Jesus with this Righteous Sufferer by inviting his readers to recognize these sharp similarities between the two characters, preparing the readers for this comparison by several methods, the clearest of which is the dispersion of allusions to this psalm throughout his passion narrative. Additionally, it is clear from the psalm that the Righteous Sufferer is in true agony and distress, and that his wretched state is not alleviated at the very instant he calls on God. Rather, he experiences a period of suffering, and the vindication that comes at the end of this torment does not *negate* the suffering that precluded it. Instead, the vindication stands in stark contrast to it, underscoring the Righteous Sufferer's predicament before this deliverance. Similarly, Mark does not attempt to soften the image of Jesus' crucifixion. Instead, he recounts the horror and shame that Jesus experienced, enhancing his portrayal of this suffering by alluding to Ps 22 throughout his passion narrative. If first-century readers took seriously Mark's allusion to the whole context of the psalm in 15:34, they could not have denied the acute sufferings that this Righteous Sufferer also experienced.

At the completion of this study, I hope to have demonstrated that the tension between the two (suffering and vindication) fits well in the narrative of Mark's gospel, and that first-century readers would have been able to recognize this (and that it would have been meaningful to them) because it would have been familiar to them.¹⁷ This tension between the suffering of God's chosen one(s) and his/her ultimate vindication by him is a theme found repeatedly in the scriptures and extra-canonical literature.¹⁸ This study will seek to explore in-depth one aspect of this

¹⁷ Mark often uses this technique of placing two (apparent) opposites in tension in his narrative. See Robert M. Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), for a thorough discussion of the literary techniques Mark uses that create this type of tension and ambiguity.

¹⁸ Rather than adopt the pervasive terminology "OT in the NT" found in the literature on intertextuality in biblical studies, I choose to avoid such anachronistic language (there was no "New

theme, the “Righteous Sufferer” figure, and will address other manifestations of this tension when appropriate. It will also be argued that Mark’s narrative fully prepares the competent first-century reader to expect this tension to take place with regard to the person of Jesus, and subsequently to his followers (Mark 8:33-35).

Without the full context of Ps 22 in view, Mark’s readers could not make this connection of identity and would miss the intention of the narrative here. A contextual reading of the citation of Ps 22:2 in Jesus’ cry of Mark 15:34 does not necessarily eliminate the fact that Jesus was in agony and distress. Rather, by making Ps 22 the prayer of Christ (Mark 14:61, 62) during his suffering on the cross, Mark finds in the words of the prayer an expression of Jesus’ own experience. Those who argue against this view may wrongly imply that this reading either necessitates a denial of Jesus’ suffering, or indicates an attempt to overshadow or display this suffering in a falsely positive light. However, a reading of Mark 15:34 with the whole context of Ps 22 in view (suffering *and* vindication) should guard against such interpretations.

Given the diversity of opinion on the function of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 and the fundamental effect this passage can have on one’s understanding of such issues as the manner of Jesus’ death, the relationship between God and Jesus in the gospel, and the suffering and vindication of God’s people, it is surprising that there exists no treatment of this subject which focuses on its meaning in light of the entire narrative of Mark’s gospel from a first-century reader’s perspective. This lacuna in Markan scholarship will become apparent in a review of the current state of research on Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 below.

History of Interpretation

In this type of study, where many different issues are examined with a view toward presenting a multifaceted argument (in this case concerning a first-century reading of Mark 15:34), it is difficult to determine the parameters for a survey of relevant scholarship. A comprehensive examination of the history of interpretation for all of the issues discussed could very well consume the entire study! In light of

Testament” at the time that the gospels were written with which to compare the “old,” and no clear evidence that there was a set “canon” of the scriptures by the first century) when referring to the authoritative texts of the Jews. The term “extra-canonical” will also replace “intertestamental.” Although it is unfortunately also anachronistic, other alternatives present similar problems.

this, the following survey has been divided into several categories that comprise the main topics that will be touched upon in this study. These categories are: (a) the use of the scriptures in the NT; (b) the use of the scriptures in Mark; and (c) Psalm 22:2 in Mark. Within the first two categories only one or two important texts are surveyed. A bibliography of additional important works on the topic is listed in a footnote. The section devoted to the issue of the function of Ps 22:2 in Mark, however, is an exception to this pattern. Since this topic is the primary focus of this study, a more detailed and lengthy survey of the important works is included. This final section is limited to a synopsis of those works that specifically address the function of Ps 22:2 in Mark.¹⁹ The works selected represent a sampling of the variety of interpretations and methodologies attributed to this passage and to Ps 22 in Mark in general.

(A) The Use of the Scriptures in the NT²⁰

D. Juel's major work concerning the broad issue of early Christian use of the scriptures, and more specifically this use in the NT, has been selected for survey because it is one of the "classics" on this issue. In addition, his premise concerning how NT writers cited the scriptures and intended their readers to understand it within its new context is fundamentally opposed to the arguments of my study. Juel also devotes significant attention to the specific issue of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34.

¹⁹ Works that do not focus specifically on Ps 22 in *Mark* (for example, those that primarily concentrate on the interpretation of Ps 22 itself) will be discussed when appropriate in the body of this study. Although some of the works addressed here do aim some of their focus on Ps 22 in Matthew and Luke, this study will concentrate on their exegesis of Mark since it relates to the primary concern of this thesis.

²⁰ Other works on this broader issue include: C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952); Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM Press LTD, 1961); Anthony T. Hanson, *The Living Utterances of God: The New Testament Exegesis of the Old* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983); Jan de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (STDJ 4; Leiden: Brill, 1965); Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975); Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985); David S. New, *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels, and the Two-Document Hypothesis* (SBLSCS 37; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993). The specific issues of intertextuality and the problem of defining citations and allusions will require extensive discussion and will therefore be addressed in the body of the thesis. Relevant works concerning these topics will be provided at that time.

Donald Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).

Juel begins his work with this self-described thesis: “The beginnings of Christian reflection can be traced to interpretations of Israel’s Scriptures, and the major focus of that scriptural interpretation was Jesus, the crucified and risen Messiah.”²¹ In response to C. H. Dodd and Barnabas Lindars, Juel argues that the use of the scriptures was to understand the gospel, rather than defend it. The scriptures, then, were used “to clarify the implications of faith in Jesus for one’s relationship with Israel’s God and with the world.”²² Juel also argues that it is the view of Jesus as Messiah that shapes the use of the scriptures (this role as Messiah is primary, as opposed to other ways of describing Jesus, such as the Suffering Servant, Son of Man, Wisdom, Righteous Sufferer, etc).

In his excursus on Dodd’s work, Juel argues that, contra Dodd’s view, atomistic exegesis was practiced by Christian and Jewish interpreters, who would extract a text from its original context in order to make an argument or bring a fresh interpretation. He also chastises Dodd for believing that the “Righteous Sufferer” psalms and Isa 53 provided a plot for understanding a typical Righteous Sufferer, stating that,

. . . if there is no evidence of such unified interpretation, however, it is difficult to rule out the possibility that Christians made use of bits of pieces of psalms or Isaiah 53 until finally a unified interpretation was produced. That would mean, however, that some other explanation would have to be offered for the use of precisely these texts. If there existed no mythic construct such as an apocalyptic Son of man or a Suffering Servant or a Righteous Sufferer, but only the scriptural potential for the construction of these figures, what appears to us as coherent interpretative traditions may well be the product of our imaginations. The so-called plots of Psalm 22 and Isaiah 53 may not have been the starting point for Christian interpretation at all but only a later byproduct.²³

²¹ Juel, *Exegesis*, 1.

²² Juel, *Exegesis*, 1.

²³ Juel, *Exegesis*, 22.

As a result of this, Juel asserts that the psalms used in the passion narratives were read as messianic because Jesus had died accused of being a messianic pretender. Thus, although there was no Jewish precedent for reading Ps 22 as messianic, Juel argues that Christians made it such because they recognized the Messiah Jesus' experience as being described in the psalms. The evidence for this falls on his argument that these psalms are linked as messianic through another psalm that was already regarded as messianic by Jewish interpreters: Ps 89. Therefore, Juel argues that the precedent for viewing these psalms in light of Jesus' death is found in messianic traditions rather than Righteous Sufferer traditions.

Juel also gives a critique of H. Gese in which he accuses him of misunderstanding first-century midrash, arguing that the Jewish interpreters were not interested in the "formal issues" that Gese attributes to them (for example, eschatology and the coming of the kingdom of God). He also notes that the second main argument of Gese is that Ps 22 depicts a paradigmatic Righteous Sufferer. However, as mentioned above, Juel (siding with Hengel) believes there to be no Righteous Sufferer tradition, arguing that Jesus is instead executed as king. How, then, was Ps 22 brought in to talk of Jesus' experience? Rather than the general plot of the psalm, Juel argues that it is the ascription to David in the title and the similar suffering vocabulary with Ps 89 and 69 that led the early Christian writers to this psalm. Why this psalm? Juel ultimately concludes that the only thing that the use of this psalm tells us is that Jesus' death was "scriptural."

Juel is right to point out that both Jewish and Christian interpreters practiced atomistic exegesis; however, the question is whether Mark did this with respect to Ps 22. Just because atomistic exegesis was practiced during that time does not mean that this is how Mark used the citation, and vice versa. We must look at the narrative clues (or lack thereof) that are given to us in order to determine whether an atomistic reading or a contextual reading is what Mark desires of his readers. It is also not clear that Mark's narrative presents Jesus as a King-Messiah to the exclusion of all other figures. The narrative here is more multidimensional, presenting Jesus as king, messiah, suffering servant, Righteous Sufferer, and son, to name a few examples. Mark's narrative suggests no such dichotomy between figures, although it is fair to say that he emphasizes some roles over others. However, like Juel I do not agree with the form-critical claim of Gese and others that it was a Righteous Sufferer tradition within which the conceptions of messiah had to be derived. On the other hand, unlike

Juel, I believe that it is possible to see the narrative as using both Righteous Sufferer and messianic language and traditions (as well as some others) to describe the uniqueness of Jesus (in essence, Mark's many allusions serve to present the fullest picture of Jesus possible. The Righteous Sufferer is just one of those!).²⁴

In the end, Juel's solution to the question of what the narratives tell us of Jesus' death in their use of Ps 22 (that Jesus' death was "scriptural") rings hollow. Certainly the gospel writers attribute more significance to the psalm than this!

(B) The Use of the Scriptures in Mark²⁵

²⁴ I do not share Juel's conviction that the events in the life of Jesus provided a type of "script" which then allowed the NT writers to find parallels in the scriptures *over against* the view that the scriptures provided the "script" and the Jesus events were made to fit the pattern(s). I believe that the dynamic between the events of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection and the language and traditions of Jewish types or figures is more fluid and integrated in the gospels than Juel seems to allow.

²⁵ Other major works that deal with this topic: 1) **form-critical**: S. Schulz, "Markus und das Alte Testament," *ZTK* 58 (1961), 184-97; 2) **"source-oriented"** (Here I have borrowed Hatina's terminology for those that are concerned with the allusions to the scriptures that form the foundation for understanding Mark's presentation of Jesus): John W. Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark: The Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah* (Studia Postbiblica 8; Leiden: Brill, 1965); J. Duncan M. Derrett, *The Making of Mark: The Scriptural Bases of the Earliest Gospel* (2 vols; Shipston-on-Stour: P. Drinkwater, 1985); Wolfgang Roth, *Hebrew Gospel: Cracking the Code of Mark* (Oak Park, IL: Meyer-Stone Books, 1988); Dale and Patricia Miller, *The Gospel of Mark as Midrash on Earlier Jewish and New Testament Literature* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 21; Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990); Willard M. Swartley, *Israel's Scripture Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels: Story Shaping Story* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994); Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark* (WUNT 2:88; Tübingen: J.C. B. Mohr, 1997); 3) **redaction-critical**: Ulrich W. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition* (SBT; London: SCM Press, 1963); Hugh Anderson, "The Old Testament in Mark's Gospel," in James M. Efird (ed.), *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972); Howard C. Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," in E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer (eds.), *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975): 165-88; Hans-Jörg Steichele, *Der leidende Sohn Gottes: Eine Untersuchung einiger alttestamentlicher Motive in der Christologie des Markusevangeliums* (Biblische Untersuchungen 14; Regensburg: Pustet, 1980), although Steichele's interest in the use of the scriptures in Mark seems only to suit his larger aim of locating a theme of the Righteous Sufferer; Willem S. Vorster, "The Function of the Use of the Old Testament in Mark," *Neot* 14 (1981), 62-72; Moo, *Old Testament*; 4) **combined methods**: Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992); Richard Schneck, *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I-VIII* (Berkeley Institute of Biblical Archaeology and Literature Dissertation Series 1; Vallejo, CA: BIBAL Press, 1994).

I have selected T. Hatina's work on the scriptures in Mark for a survey because it is broader in scope than other works on this subject. This is due to his methodology, which has a narrative-critical emphasis while maintaining a concern for historical-critical issues as well as redaction-critical. In addition, Hatina's narrative emphasis is in line with the emphasis of this study. A. Suhl's monograph on the scriptures in Mark is also surveyed below because it constitutes the only work that examines all of the "formal" scriptural citations in the gospel to date, and is thus a primary source to be reckoned with when addressing this topic.

Thomas R. Hatina, *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative* (JSNTSup 232; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).

Hatina's focus in this book based on his University of Bristol PhD dissertation is clearly stated from the beginning. It has two objectives: (a) to survey and critique those works that have sought to explain and examine Mark's use of the scriptures in his gospel, especially focusing on the various methodologies used to undertake this task; and (b) to advocate a model for reading these passages that takes seriously their function in the entire narrative of Mark's gospel, while still maintaining the value of and remaining sensitive to the historical setting of the gospel.

It is Hatina's persistent call for readers to give priority to the narrative of the gospel, allowing it to be the primary influence and context within which the citation is interpreted, that distinguishes his methodology and his readings of key passages where Mark cites the scriptures. He laments the fact that the narrative context is often relegated to a subordinate status in the previous works that have addressed Mark's use of the scriptures. He argues against reading pericopae in light of the external context (for example, historical setting or tradition history) before reading them in light of the surrounding narrative. His claim is that "the order of enquiry should begin with the latter if at all possible."²⁶

Hatina deals with a selective group of scriptural citations in Mark: (1) Exod 23:20; Mal 3:1; and Isa 40:3 in Mark 1:2-3; (2) Isa 6:9-10 in Mark 4:12; (3) Isa 29:13 in Mark 7:6-7; (4) Ps 118:26 in Mark 11:9; and (5) Isa 13:10; 34:4; Dan 7:13; Zech 2:10 and Deut 30:4 in Mark 13:24-27. One might wonder why he chooses these and

²⁶ Hatina, *Search*, 2.

excludes others, but his reasoning becomes clear as the book and his argument progresses. According to Hatina, what holds the scriptural citations and allusions in Mark's gospel together is "the ideological point of view, shared by Jesus and the narrator, that the kingdom of God has come in and through Jesus," a "hermeneutical key" to the interpretation of the narrative.²⁷ Thus, the conflict between the Jewish religious authorities, who are representatives of the kingdom of Satan, and Jesus, the representative of the kingdom of God, drives the plot of Mark's gospel, and his scriptural citations and allusions are intended to be understood within this framework.

However, *contra* Hatina, it is not clear that a thematic framework is necessary in order to understand the intention of the narrative. Is the continuity of the story found in a theme, or in the person of Jesus? Is it not sufficient to say that the focus of the narrative is on the person of Jesus, and that it is the intention of the narrative to elucidate exactly whom Jesus is which holds the meaning of these scriptural citations and allusions together? This broader focus of the narrative can then house several themes that contribute to the portrayal of the identity of Jesus, within which Hatina's "hermeneutical key" can be found. Similarly, Hatina's framework of the conflict between the kingdom of God (Jesus) and the kingdom of Satan (the Jewish religious authorities) does not account for some of the key scriptural passages cited or alluded to within the narrative (for instance, he does not attempt to explain how our passage, Ps 22 in Mark 15:34, fits into this schema). Hatina also sets himself up for criticism when he consistently argues against allowing the original context of a citation to aid in its interpretation in Mark's gospel (arguing that it is external to the narrative within which the citation is used), except when the original context fits into his overall hermeneutical framework!²⁸

Hatina's focus on the narrative's role in shaping the meaning of Mark's citations and allusions has clear affinities with the focus of my study. It appears that Hatina's distinction from the other works on the scriptures in Mark is a matter of emphasis; the narrative is given first priority and the external issues are given

²⁷ Hatina, *Search*, 3.

²⁸ For example, in Hatina, *Search*, 238, he argues that there is a parallel drawn between the blindness of Israel during the time of Isaiah, and the blindness of Israel as represented by the crowd in Mark's passage. He allows the context of Isaiah to interpret this passage because he states that it is consistent with the narrative (and because it fits with his own hermeneutical key?).

second, which adheres with the intent of this study. His assertion that a framework within which to interpret the citations and allusions should be found within the narrative itself and not imported from other contexts (for example, Isaiah's new exodus²⁹) takes seriously the new context within which the citation is found, while not denying the possible influence which the original context might have on the interpretation of the passage.

Alfred Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965).

As stated above, Suhl's book is currently the only work that examines all of the "formal" scriptural citations in Mark's gospel. In it he argues that the Parousia was imminent for Mark and thus forms the eschatological emphasis for his work (since it was of importance for his implied readers). He rejects the assertion that Mark's use of scriptural citations belongs in the category of promise-fulfillment (as in Matthew's gospel) because salvation history is not a concern of Mark. Instead, Suhl believes that Mark is primarily concerned with the apocalyptic present. He even argues against interpreting as promise-fulfillment those texts that appear to be explicit in calling for this interpretive schema (such as Mark 9:12,13 and 14:49). For Suhl, the function of scripture in Mark is simply its presentation of Jesus as one who is in accordance with God's will.

This interpretation of the function of the scriptures in Mark is evident in his brief comments upon the Markan Jesus' citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34. Here Suhl once again reiterates his main argument that Mark's scriptural citations do not represent a promise-fulfillment schema. Instead, according to Suhl, these words indicate that Jesus remained in harmony with God while dying.

Suhl has been rightly criticized for ignoring the fact that there are passages in Mark that indeed belong under the umbrella of promise-fulfillment.³⁰ Although it is true that many of Mark's scriptural citations are not formulaic, as in Matthew's gospel, Suhl's overbearing interpretive schema silences those that are clearly functioning within the category of promise-fulfillment. Suhl's fundamental problem

²⁹ E. g., Watts, *New Exodus*.

³⁰ E. g., Hatina, *Search*, 25-28.

in this regard is his simplistic definition of promise-fulfillment as a one-to-one correspondence between the predicted event and the occurring event. In addition, Suhl's outright rejection of the existence of a Markan interest in salvation history might lead one to question why Mark would use the scriptures at all, since these references draw a line of continuity between the story of Israel and the story of Jesus. I would argue that Suhl's thesis (that Mark's use of the scriptures signifies that Jesus is in accordance with the will of God) implicitly affirms that, for Mark, the scriptures were the expression of God's will, and it was within these scriptures that God's will was manifested through his salvific acts toward his people Israel. In other words, one cannot draw a sharp line between Israel's scriptures and Israel's salvation history.

*(C) Psalm 22:2 in Mark*³¹

Vernon K. Robbins, "The Reversed Contextualization of Psalm 22 in the Markan Crucifixion: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (ed. F. Van Segbroeck; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1161-83.

Using his methodology of socio-rhetorical criticism, Robbins provides an intertextual study of Ps 22 in Mark's crucifixion account. In this essay he seeks to push the boundaries of intertextual interpretation of the passion narrative beyond Jewish and Christian literature, arguing that Dio Chrysostom's *Oration 4* presents an "alternative to traditional interpretation of the scenes" of Mark's passion narrative. Before discussing this, however, he examines Mark's account of the crucifixion (15:1-46). He then underscores the parallel events of the gospel account and Dio Chrysostom's account of a Persian ritual during the Sacian feast. These similarities include: (a) taking a condemned prisoner (Dio 4:67; Mark 15:15-16); and (b) treating him as a king (Dio 4:67; Mark 15:17-19); then (c) stripping and scourging him before hanging him (Dio 4:67; Mark 15:15, 20, 25) with his response being; (d) crying out or wailing (Dio 4:69; Mark 15:34).

Robbins then examines the rhetorical language of Ps 22 in Mark's passion narrative in order to discover how Mark includes language from the psalm. He concludes by arguing that the allusions and citation of Ps 22 are found in the

³¹ Additional works that address this topic will be engaged in the body of this study.

narrative in reverse order from the psalm itself. Thus, Robbins postulates, Mark's account is a subversion of the rhetoric of the psalm. He accuses those who read Mark 15:34 as a cry that carries with it a positive meaning of imposing the rhetoric of Ps 22 on the rhetoric of Mark's passion narrative. The psalmist expresses hope to the end, while Jesus ends with an expression of abandonment. He reads Jesus' expression as a question that is void of any hope for rescue.

Robbins' socio-rhetorical methodology provides a refreshing way of looking at familiar material. His emphasis on a wider range of intertextual possibilities is especially interesting. Since I will interact with Robbins' work more closely in the latter part of my study, it will be adequate at this point simply to observe that his methodology raises a fundamental question about how the narrative is read in light of the events it narrates. This involves a consideration of the nature of the relationship between the events in the story of Jesus' crucifixion as narrated in Mark and the events that take place in the account of the persecution of the Righteous Sufferer in Ps 22. For instance, do the events of the narrative of Jesus' crucifixion lead the writer to see affinities between the Jesus story and Ps 22 *or* does Mark's "reverse" use of Ps 22 become primary and thus drives the narrative of the passion? Robbins' approach assumes the latter, so much so that, according to his schema, the presence of the (supposed) reversed order of the psalm becomes the primary rubric with which to interpret the events of Jesus' death. In the following study I will argue that to take the Markan narrative as the driving force is to guard against this type of interpretation. Although Robbins asserts that his interpretation gives priority to Mark's narrative, in the end his focus is not on the Markan narrative of Jesus' death, but on the subverted narrative of the psalmist.

Moreover, if the issue of "mockery" is the lynchpin between these two texts, as Robbins' suggests, one could ask why Mark chose *this* psalm, a psalm that clearly concludes in hope and vindication for the sufferer? And how do we know that this mockery is the connecting point rather than one of the other allusions to Ps 22? It appears that Robbins has chosen this motif because it provides a connection with the Dio Chrysostom passage.

In addition, the supposed reversed order of Ps 22 in the Markan narrative is interrupted if one takes the centurion's confession of 15:39 as an allusion to the worship of the nations in the thanksgiving section of the psalm. Again, these issues will be addressed in detail in the body of this study.

Hartmut Gese, “Psalm 22 und das Neue Testament: Der älteste Bericht vom Tode Jesu und die Entstehung des Herrenmahles,” in *Vom Sinai zum Zion* (BevT 64; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1974), 180-201.

Gese’s essay is a foundational work on Ps 22 and its function in the gospel passion narratives. In it, he searches for the significance of Ps 22:2 in its placement on the lips of Jesus at the moment of his death in the narratives. He begins by asserting that “*Es ist ja von vornherein wahrscheinlich, daß das Zitat des Psalmfanges den ganzen Psalm meint. . .*”³² It is from this premise that he proceeds to an exegesis of the psalm itself, an endeavor which makes up the bulk of his work here.

Gese, operating with a form-critical approach, argues that Ps 22 is composed of an individual lamentation (*Klagelied*) followed by an individual thanksgiving (*Danklied*). He exegetes the psalm with a concentration on the structure of the psalm as a key to understanding its meaning. This is evidenced by his concern with parallel structures throughout the psalm, such as the *doppelte Rückgriff* of Ps 22:11b (“My God are you”) and Ps 22:12a (“Be not far”), which recalls the similar statements in Ps 22:2,³³ and the three-fold self-description in Ps 22:15-16 paralleling the three-fold description of his enemies in Ps 22:18-19. True to his form-critical methodology, Gese is concerned with discerning which portions of the psalm are the earliest materials and underscoring the two genres (lament and thanksgiving) within the psalm.

Gese finds the *tôdā*, or the thanksgiving-sacrifice meal, the *Sitz im Leben* of the thanksgiving portion of the psalm (Ps 22:23-32). Inherent in the *tôdā* is the offer of praise to Yahweh as Rescuer in the presence of one’s community. He argues that the significance of the *tôdā* in the psalm is found in the speaker’s renewed existence in the community after his existence has just been threatened. According to Gese, the unity of Ps 22 proves that the lament is spoken in order to reconstruct the rescue in a cultic context, praising Yahweh for what he has done. He also sees in Ps 22 an apocalyptic theology, as the rescue of the individual from death brings about the in-breaking of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, evidenced by the conversion of the world (Ps 22:28, 29), the resurrection of the dead (Ps 22:30), and the proclamation of the *Heilstat* of Yahweh into the future (Ps 22:31, 32). It is this in-breaking of the

³² Gese, “Psalm 22,” 180.

³³ Another request for God’s nearness to the speaker is again made in Ps 22:20.

kingdom of God that Gese believes draws the gospel writers to Ps 22 in their passion narratives. He argues that Ps 22 alone provides the background for the original crucifixion account in Mark (and that references to other psalms were added later, as were the other events that do not directly relate to Ps 22, i.e. the Elijah misunderstanding and the rending of the temple veil),

*Wir sehen: Die älteste Darstellung des zentralen Ereignisses des Todes Jesu wird verborgen unter dem Schleier von Ps 22. Damit werden wir hier nicht nur eine alte Interpretation des Todes Jesu vor uns haben, sondern, wie mir scheint, das älteste Verständnis des Golgathageschehens.*³⁴

For Gese, the primary connection between Ps 22 and Mark's passion narrative is the connection between the *tôdā* and the Eucharist, itself a reconstruction of the death and rescue of the Risen One: "Thus as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord, until he comes" (1 Cor 11:26). Thus the in-breaking of the kingdom of God that is reminiscent in Ps 22 is made a reality in the death (lament) and resurrection (*tôdā*) of Jesus Christ. The fulfillment of Ps 22 is carried out in the event of Jesus' death and resurrection, and the Eucharist is a confession of this event, just as the *tôdā* was the confession of the individual's rescue by Yahweh.

Gese's form-critical approach necessarily leads him to omit the parts of Mark's passion narrative which he regards as later traditions, and thus prohibits him from interpreting Ps 22 in Mark 15:34 in light of its surrounding narrative context. His connection of the *tôdā* with the Eucharist has also been roundly criticized as lacking sufficient evidence that the sacrament is in view in Mark's account of Jesus' death. As with others, Gese assumes that the whole context of the psalm is in view when the first line is cited.

John H. Reumann, "Psalm 22 at the Cross: Lament and Thanksgiving for Jesus Christ," *Int* 28 (1974): 39-58.

Reumann begins his article by interpreting Ps 22 (or observing and agreeing with the interpretations of others). Like Caza (below), Reumann underscores the paradox of the cry of Ps 22:2: "... the lament not only questions God's goodness in current experience but also lays claim to him, thus setting up a tension which persists

³⁴ Gese, "Psalm 22," 196.

throughout.”³⁵ In agreement with Gese, he sees the background of the thanksgiving section of the psalm as the *tôdā*. He then offers two possibilities for the use of Ps 22 in Judaism. One possibility, in agreement with Gese, is that the psalm was recited in the *tôdā* ceremonies. The other is that pious Jews used the psalm when they faced sickness, oppression, or death. The latter might even have led to a use of the first verse as a proverbial saying.³⁶ Unfortunately, Reumann merely leaves these as open possibilities and does not side with one or the other.

In his examination of Ps 22 in Mark, Reumann addresses what he refers to as “three levels of meaning”: (a) Mark’s interpretation in his gospel; (b) evidence of any earlier written or oral sources; and (c) Ps 22 in light of the historical Jesus. He argues that the meaning of Ps 22 in the Markan passion narrative is that “Jesus came, according to the will and plan of God (known from scripture), the Son of man, ‘to give his life a ransom for many’; suffering, in such a way as had become traditional in psalms of lament, obedient in sonship, and ultimately triumphant via the power of God. . . .”³⁷ He then examines the Markan passion narrative from a form-critical standpoint, concluding that at least some of the allusions to the scriptures were present in the “pre-Markan account.” Where does Ps 22 come into this? He concludes that both the arguments for and against the historical Jesus actually quoting Ps 22:2 fall short, and that parts of Gese’s theory still need some work in order to be fully convincing. In the end, the result of Reumann’s efforts is to affirm that Ps 22 “came to supreme expression in Jesus” as one who lamented in his suffering and gave thanksgiving for God’s actions.

Perhaps the greatest value of Reumann’s article is that he combines a discussion of many of the important issues concerning Ps 22 in Mark in one place. He concentrates on this discussion from a form-critical standpoint, most often citing form-critical scholars, and thus has a singular methodological focus in this regard. It is unfortunate that in the process of critiquing others he rarely comes to his own solutions to the problem. One would be hard-pressed to find a scholar who would argue with his very general conclusion, that Ps 22 formed an important background for Mark’s understanding of Jesus’ suffering and death on the cross.

³⁵ Reumann, “Psalm 22,” 44.

³⁶ Reumann, “Psalm 22,” 48, attributes this idea to his conversations with Geza Vermes.

³⁷ Reumann, “Psalm 22,” 52.

James L. Mays, “Prayer and Christology: Psalm 22 as Perspective on the Passion,” *ThTo* 42 (1985): 322-31.

Mays begins by noting that Ps 22 is the primary scriptural resource from which the gospel writers draw their interpretations of Jesus’ passion. He joins with those who argue that the citation in Mark 15:34 has the whole psalm in view, underscoring its function as one of identification, identifying Jesus with the suffering psalmist. He states that Jews would often find meaning in their present situation by appealing to established tradition. He understands Ps 22 to be functioning this way in the passion narratives. Thus, his aim in this article is to view Jesus through the language and form of this prayer in order to bring out a clearer picture of the relation between the two.

Mays believes Ps 22 to have been composed for liturgical use, hence his focus on Ps 22 and the psalm in the gospel passion narratives as prayer. Thus, he regards it as paradigmatic, a prayer that individuals would pray in their time of distress. In the process of taking this psalm as their personal prayer, individuals would locate themselves in the company of those who likewise prayed the psalm. Therefore, in the gospel narratives, Jesus himself joins this company. Mays regards Ps 22 as the most appropriate of these psalms to be applied to Jesus because of its scope (suffering → vindication), intensity, and comprehensiveness.

Mays’ approach is a refreshing one. By taking the psalm as his starting point, he seeks to find thematic touch-points between it and the gospel presentations of Jesus in his passion. Of these touch-points, identity (of the psalmist and Jesus) is key. Although his approach is fundamentally different from my study, since he begins with the psalm and works his way toward the gospel passion narratives rather than beginning with the narrative itself, his insights are a useful addition to the present discussion.

Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah—From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives* (2 vols.; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1994).

In his magisterial two-volume work on the death of Jesus, Brown covers a gamut of issues concerning the passion narratives of all four gospels. In his section on Jesus’ “Death Cry” of Mark 15:34/Matthew 27:46, Brown surveys several justifications or

motivations for rejecting the “surface import” that Jesus is expressing his forsakenness by God. Among these are: (a) a denial that this cry implies his own desperation, but rather the desperation on behalf of sinners or Jews; (b) an attempt to harmonize these words of Jesus in Mark and Matthew with Luke and John; (c) offering an obscure translation of the Aramaic or Hebrew (which goes against Mark’s own translation/interpretation in 15:34b); (d) arguing that a literal interpretation would result in a denial of Jesus’ divinity; and (e) believing that despair is a major sin, and that Jesus committed no sin. He focuses special attention on whether or not the general context of Ps 22 is in view in this passage. He argues that to incorporate the triumphant meaning of the second half of the psalm is “to take almost the opposite meaning of what Jesus is portrayed as saying.”³⁸

Ultimately, Brown does not find any argument for reading the psalm contextually in Mark 15:34 persuasive, and sees the attribution of the literal feeling of forsakenness found in the psalm the appropriate way of reading the passage. In addition, he underscores the fact that the Markan passion narrative includes allusions to only the first portion (the lament) of Ps 22, but acknowledges the possibility that the gospel writers’ post-crucifixion account was influenced by the thanksgiving portion of the psalm (although ultimately he is not convinced by this on the grounds that there are no clear allusions to the second half of the psalm in the resurrection narrative).

In another section of his book, Brown discusses the role of Ps 22 in the passion narratives in general. He sees in Ps 22 a fitting background for Christian application to Jesus’ own experience of suffering, specifically in light of the parallels found in Qumran’s application of similar attributes and experiences to their Righteous Teacher in 1QH XIII, 5-19 (the speaker’s self-described suffering at the hands of his enemies, his assertion that God has heard his cry, his proclamation that God has delivered his soul).

Brown seems to fall into the same trap as those mentioned in the introductory section of this study. He assumes that the motivation for incorporating the meaning of the whole context of Ps 22 into Mark 15:34 must *necessarily* be to reject or soften the interpretation of the passage as one concerning the forsakenness of Jesus. Although this has been the trend in scholarship in the past, it must be reiterated that this dichotomy is not necessary, nor does it do justice to the integrity of Mark’s

³⁸ Brown, *Death*, 1050.

narrative or the integrity of the psalm. With Ps 22 comes both distress at being forsaken and rejoicing in God's vindication. The "literal" interpretation of the cry does not exclude the significance of the context of Ps 22.

Tom Thatcher, "(Re)Mark(s) on the Cross," *BibInt* 4 (1996): 346-61.

The main focus of Thatcher's article is to critique Raymond Brown's interpretation of Ps 22 in Mark. However, since I have provided my own summary and critique of Brown above, I will focus here only on Thatcher's own interpretation located in the latter half of his essay.

Using Michael Riffaterre's semeiotics of poetry,³⁹ Thatcher argues that, in order to understand the meaning of Ps 22 in Mark's passion narrative, Ps 22 should be read in light of its use in Mark, rather than the "meaning" of Ps 22 being transferred onto the account of Jesus' passion. This is based on his assertion that Christians read the scriptures christologically, i.e. against the background of the person of Jesus. Thus, Thatcher deems it inappropriate to interpret Ps 22 before examining how the gospel writers used it to illuminate the passion of Jesus.

Thatcher notes the differences between Mark's allusions to the psalm and the events of the psalm itself. He points out that the overlapping events of the psalm and of the passion narrative are not in the same order, and that those events are taken from the lament portion of the psalm. This leads him to conclude that there is no positive element in Mark's use of Ps 22; that this is an account of the despair of Jesus and has no hint of vindication narrated at the end of the psalm. He also observes that, although all of the events recounted in the psalm are situated with reference to the cry in the first verse, in Mark all events are situated around the crucifixion. He regards this as the key indication that "Mark is reading the psalm through the Jesus story, rather than the Jesus story through the psalm."⁴⁰

Thatcher's work is helpful. However, it must be remembered that the early Christians were already familiar with the scriptures and had a long history of interpretation of them before Jesus' life, death, and resurrection. It seems unlikely, and even impossible, that they would have been able to (or would want to, for that

³⁹ Michael Riffaterre, *Text Production* (trans. Terese Lyons; New York: Columbia University Press, 1983).

⁴⁰ Thatcher, "(Re)Mark(s)," 360.

matter!) throw out all previous understanding of the scriptures and read it completely anew while wearing their “Jesus lenses.” Thus, the issue of intertextuality seems much more complicated than Thatcher makes it out to be. It is more likely that both the Jesus event and the scriptures were regarded in some sense as mutually interpretive. Therefore, an interpretation of Ps 22 can bring things to the text of Mark, just as Mark’s presentation of Jesus can bring things to the text of the psalm.

Lorraine Caza, *Mon Dieu, pourquoi m’as-tu abandonné?* (Recherches Nouvelle Série 24; Montréal: Bellarmin, 1989).

Caza argues that there is not sufficient evidence to show that citing the first line of a psalm or passage to invoke the whole context of that passage was a practice that was used in first-century literature or would even be recognized if it was practiced. In support of this, she points to Luke’s passion narrative, where he substitutes the citation of Ps 22:2 with an allusion to Ps 31 (and from the middle, no less!). In a different tactic, she appeals to the multiple allusions to the opponents of the sufferer throughout Mark’s passion narrative as the indication that the whole of Ps 22 is in view here. She finds a clear parallel between *la presentation des ennemis* in Ps 22:7-9 and 13-19 and the opponents of Jesus in Mk 15:29-32 and 36.

Jesus is to be seen as one who is in solidarity with the persecuted of Israel, i. e., all those who might have spoken this lamentation individually during their times of distress. She argues that, while being a cry of distress towards God, it also poignantly signifies a confidence in God and already indicates the salvation that awaits him and the community. Caza recognizes that this salvation is hard to comprehend in this singular cry of distress, but likens it to the seemingly antithetical images of abandonment in Ps 22:2 and the irruption of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in Ps 22:28-32, and sees the counterpart to the cry of Jesus as the centurion’s confession in Mark 15:39. She sees in Jesus’ cry in Mark 15:34 the actual launching of the kingdom of God.

Along with Gese, she sees an integration of the picture of the death of Jesus with praise and blessing in the context of a communion meal, which is conveyed in Mark 14:22-25, where Jesus blesses the bread and the cup which represents his death for the sake of the community.

Although Caza’s work is a massive volume of information, she focuses only on the Markan passion narrative and does not address how the entire narrative might

help in illuminating Mark 15:34 and its immediate context. In fact, she delves into the rest of the gospel only to examine Mark's presentation of Jesus' opponents, which she believes is the central motivation for reading the whole context of Ps 22 into the passion narrative.

A. E. Schwemer, "Jesu letzte Worte am Kreuz (Mk 15, 34; Lk 23, 46; Joh 19, 28ff)," *TBei* 29 (1998): 5-29.

Schwemer's main focus in the Mark section of this article is to discover whether the Ps 22 citation in Mark 15:34 is part of the "historical kernel" underlying Mark's passion narrative. She begins by discussing the *Legendenmotiven* found in Mark and especially in the passion account: the tearing of the sky and temple veil, and "the conversion of the executioner" (*Bekehrung des Henkers*). She then moves to the main issue: the *Sterbegebet* of Jesus.

Of primary concern to Schwemer is the language of Jesus' cry on the cross. She argues that the phrase *ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι* is derived from the Aramaic Targum of the Psalms. Thus, she argues that Mark places in the mouth of Jesus correct Judean Aramaic. She also believes the Greek translation to be derived from the Aramaic and not the LXX version of the psalm, as most scholars hold. This is due to the absence of the additional phrases in the LXX (*πρόσχες μοι and μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς σωτηρίας μου οἱ λόγοι τῶν παραπτωμάτων μου*). According to Schwemer, an interpretation of Jesus' cry as indicating confidence or triumph rather than complaint is an artificial one. However, she does hold that the entire psalm was "before the eyes" of the Evangelist, as it begins with the invocation to God as King and ends with his universal recognition as such. She concludes by asserting that Mark 15:34 is indeed part of the earliest tradition in Mark's gospel.

Due to her redaction-critical methodology, which guides her concern for finding the "historical kernel" within the Markan passion narrative, the majority of Schwemer's study serves an entirely different purpose than will the current study. The reference to the whole of Mark's narrative as a guide to understanding how his first-century readers would have read Mark 15:34 will set my work in a fundamentally different direction. However, the portion of Schwemer's work that deals with the language of the Ps 22 citation and Mark's translation of it is helpful and will be addressed in the appropriate section of this study.

Mark G. V. Hoffman, “Psalm 22 (LXX 21) and the Crucifixion of Jesus” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1996).

In his quest to understand how early Christians found in Ps 22 meaning for Jesus’ crucifixion, Hoffman exegetes Ps 22 and discusses the various pre-Christian, rabbinic and early Church fathers interpretations of Ps 22. He examines the portions of Ps 22 that link it to several traditions about a son of God, a righteous person, a servant of the Lord, an heir of David, and a prophet in order to see how this psalm could have been linked to Jesus’ death as Messiah.

On the basis of μακράν ἀπὸ τῆς σωτηρίας μου οἱ λόγοι τῶν παραπτωμάτων μου (“my trespasses”) in the LXX version of Ps 22:2, Hoffman argues that Ps 22 was not necessarily understood as a psalm about a righteous man, and therefore argues against labeling this person (or Jesus) a “Righteous Sufferer.” He also maintains that Ps 22 was not regarded in the pre-Christian era as a messianic text. Rather, it was the parallel potential readings of Ps 22 with the events of Jesus’ death that lead the gospel authors to regard Ps 22 as a meaningful source for understanding the passion of Jesus.

Hoffman also discusses the pre-Christian history of interpretation of Ps 22:2. He notes that only one other time is God said to have abandoned someone (2 Chr 32:31); most of the language of abandonment (ἐγκαταλείπω, עָזַב) states that God did not abandon a person or people. The threat of abandonment by God was in response to a person’s sin. Thus, early Christian interpreters struggled to understand how this threat could be attributed to the righteous Jesus.

As most of his work refers to Ps 22 itself, Hoffman’s study devotes a relatively small space to the issue of Ps 22 in the NT, and even less to Mark’s gospel. Yet, Hoffman’s work in Ps 22 and its theological interpretation is quite helpful in setting the groundwork for an understanding of its use in Mark. Especially relevant for this study will be the issue of whether or not the use of Ps 22 in Mark would have led his first-century readers to identify Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer. This is contingent on whether they understood Ps 22 to be speaking of a righteous figure.

Frederick W. Danker, “The Demonic Secret in Mark: A Reexamination of the Cry of Dereliction (15:34),” *ZNW* 61 (1970): 48-69.

In an effort to understand the meaning of Jesus’ cry from the cross in Mark 15:34, and also its relationship to the “loud cry” recorded at Jesus’ last breath in Mark 15:37, Danker develops the rather creative argument that the explanation for such cries can be attributed to the Markan Jesus being demon-possessed. To substantiate this claim, Danker strives to show a link between the temptation of Jesus (Mark 1:13), where he is initially possessed, and the end of the crucifixion scene (Mark 15:34, 37), where Jesus’ words and actions are meant to indicate his self-exorcism of the demon, at the cost of his life. In the course of his argument, he sees such elements of the narrative as the charge of blasphemy in Mark 14:64 (which is meant to be understood as a charge of demonic influence) and the darkness which precedes the climax of Jesus’ death in Mark 15:33 (a sign of active demonic forces at work) as evidence which indicates Jesus’ demon-possession. According to Danker, there is Markan irony to be found in the fact that Jesus is presented as one who struggles with and ultimately overcomes demonic influence, while those who oppose him (such as the High Priest and the passers-by at the cross) are portrayed as in league with demons.

Although Danker’s article makes for interesting reading, his assertions receive no real support from Mark’s narrative. Despite Danker’s claims, the Markan Jesus is never presented as one who is possessed or controlled by a demon (see Mark 3:20-30). In fact, Mark’s brevity on the subject of Jesus’ temptation in the wilderness might suggest just the opposite—that the episode was dealt with by Jesus without much incident. The mention of the angels at the end of the verse also indicates that Jesus overcame the temptation, not that he succumbed to it. An additional blow to Danker’s argument is the fact that he fails to account for the provenance of Jesus’ cry from the cross in Mark 15:34. He ignores the fact that the cry is a citation from Ps 22, and prefers to read it as an indication that Jesus is struggling with Satan to the very end. Finally, the lack of any indication or reference to demonic possession in Mark’s passion-resurrection narrative deals a fatal blow to Danker’s thesis.

The Contributions of this Study and Its Approach:

Especially lacking from the works listed above is a reading of Mark 15:34 that takes seriously its function in the whole narrative of the gospel (most readings are limited to the passion narrative alone), specifically in its portrayal of the person and work of Jesus. There is a need for an examination of the function of this passage in light of the narrative within which it is placed, for any clue to meaning examined in isolation from its context ceases to be *information*, but is merely *data*.⁴¹ It is possible that some of the theological difficulties that have stemmed from interpretations of this passage will be overcome when this examination takes place. That this study is from a narrative-critical perspective, then, means that the entire narrative of Mark's gospel will be considered when interpreting the focal passage, Mark 15:34. This is in contrast to other studies that have considered either the passage itself in isolation from its context, or the passage only in light of the passion narrative proper.

At the heart of this study is the desire to see the text "through the eyes," and to hear the text "with the ears" of the first-century reader in order to understand more fully how the relationship between Jesus' life, death, and resurrection and the sufferings and vindication of the lamenter in Ps 22 was perceived. Moreover, there is currently no work on this passage that seeks to examine it primarily from the perspective of the gospel's first-century readers, the implied readers of Mark's gospel. This is clearly a difficult task to undertake, as we do not now have access to the interpretations of Mark's original target audience. Thus, a focus on the socio-cultural milieu of Mark's gospel with reference to various issues related to our passage and its presentation of Jesus (Chapter 5 of this study) may indicate how Mark's implied readers would most likely have read and interpreted his use of Ps 22 in that presentation. Also, an examination of how the writers of the other synoptic gospels adopted and adapted Mark's narrative will be undertaken at the end of this study, as they are our only tangible first-century readers of the gospel. These strategies, along with a treatment of Mark's gospel which is sensitive to the clues and connections that may indicate the intended effect upon the original audience, can help to paint a general portrait of Mark's implied readers and their probable

⁴¹ I credit Margaret Barker, "Resurrection: Reflections on a New Approach," in *Resurrection* (eds. S. Porter, M. Hayes, and D. Tombs; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 99, for this helpful distinction.

interpretations of the narrative and especially the focal passage of this study, Mark 15:34.

It must be stated at the outset that I am not using the term “implied reader” in the manner normally used in literary studies, i. e., a more abstract concept of a reader that is projected by the narrative and not one that necessarily corresponds to a “real” or historical reader.⁴² Although the implied reader of this study is understood as the reader projected by the narrative, I also envision that reader as one that corresponds in some sense to a historical community of readers and hearers (more will be said about this below). In other words, Mark is writing his gospel for a specific group whom he thought would be his readers.

What can be said about Mark’s implied readers more generally from the outset can help to explain the relationship between the text, its readers, and its audience. The terms “readers” and “audience” are distinguished by the varying reading and interpretive competencies that might be expected of each, given the historical evidence of how texts were read in early Christian communities during the first century C.E. The vast majority of scholars agree that most early Christians were relatively illiterate, and thus were not technically “readers,” but were rather “hearers” of the gospels.⁴³ Those who were literate read the gospels out loud in the context of worship, and it is likely that these readings were accompanied by questions and discussion from the audience.⁴⁴ In this study the term “audience” will be used only when talking about the general Christian community (including those who could not read), while “reader” will refer specifically to individuals who might have read the text to the audience and who would have had the competencies to understand and explain it to them. The vast majority of references to the recipients of Mark’s gospel in this study will employ the term (implied) “reader,” with the understanding that his interpretation/explanation of the passage would then be disseminated to the larger

⁴² See Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), especially xi-xiv, and 274-94.

⁴³ E. g., Martin Hengel, “Eye-Witness Memory and the Writing of the Gospels,” in *The Written Gospel* (eds. M. Bockmuehl and D. Hagner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 92; Richard A. Burridge, “Who Writes, Why, and for Whom?,” in *The Written Gospel* (eds. M. Bockmuehl and D. Hagner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 99-100; Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 5, 141, and 203-41.

⁴⁴ Hengel, “Eye-Witness,” 92. He cites 1 Cor 14:29-35 and Acts 19:9 as evidence for this practice in the earliest Christian communities.

Markan audience. I will only refer to Mark's (implied) "audience," then, when distinguishing it from the implied reader.

The distinction between the implied reader of the text and the implied audience of the text is extremely important for the purposes of this study. It means that the level of competency for which I am arguing (in interpreting Mark's use of Ps 22 in Mark 15:34) has only to be located in the implied *reader*, not in the average first-century Christian.⁴⁵ Once again, given the context of the reading of the gospels in the first century (worship) and the evidence within Mark itself (13:14), it is likely that these readers not only read the text, but provided interpretation and explanation for the audience as well.⁴⁶ In this case, it is not at all out of the question to argue that Mark's implied readers would have read and understood his use of Ps 22 and especially his citation of Ps 22:2 contextually, an ability which would require significant interpretive competency and knowledge of the scriptural passage itself—an ability which the average first-century Christian might not have possessed.⁴⁷

The primary aim of this study is to answer the following questions:

- (1) Is the citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 contextual, and if so, how was this indicated to first-century readers in the narrative of his gospel?

⁴⁵ Against Mary Ann Beavis, *Mark's Audience: The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4.11-12* (JSNTSup 33; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), who argues that the Markan audience was predominantly scholastic and that the author was a missionary-teacher who taught other missionaries. Although for different reasons (his concern is to locate the Markan community in a rural village setting), I am more inclined to agree with R. L. Rohrbaugh, "The Social Location of the Markan Audience," *Int* 47 (1993): 380-95, who argues that the competencies of the audience do not have to match those of the author of the gospel himself: "... it is enough to assert that it is not necessary that the social level of the audience match that of the author, especially since Mark's Gospel was almost certainly written to be read aloud or recited from memory. There is no doubt that a few literate people, such as Beavis envisages, were in Mark's audience; and it is likely that one of them read his Gospel aloud for nonliterate" (382). I argue that the same could be said with regard to the implied reader and the audience.

⁴⁶ Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 141.

⁴⁷ This study will not be concerned with the exact geographical location of the Markan community. See Brian J. Incigneri, *The Gospel to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel* (Biblical Interpretation Series 65; Leiden: Brill, 2003); and Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press LTD., 1985), 1-30; for the argument that Mark's community was located in Rome. See Howard C. Kee, *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977), 102-105; and Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. L. Maloney; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992), 236-49; for locations in Syria/Palestine.

(2) How does the context of Ps 22 shape the meaning of Mark 15:34, the portrayal of Jesus' death in Mark's gospel, and the readers' understanding of the person of Jesus?

In order to answer these questions adequately, this study will appeal to two general categories of evidence in support of its thesis: extratextual evidence and intratextual evidence. Extratextual evidence refers to the types of evidence outside of the gospel of Mark that might help us to determine how Mark's first-century readers would have understood Mark 15:34. This will include an investigation of the presence of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer around the time of Mark's gospel, an examination of how the psalms (in general) and Ps 22 (specifically) were used both liturgically and textually both before, during, and after the first century C.E., and an exploration of how Matthew and Luke have interpreted and/or incorporated Mark's use of Ps 22 and the accompanying Righteous Sufferer language (i.e. regarding Matthew and Luke as our only "tangible" first-century readers). Intratextual evidence will consist of a study of the importance of resurrection in the Markan narrative, an examination of a selection of scriptural explicit citations and allusions in Mark (with a view toward discerning whether or not the original context of the citation or allusion is consistent with, or illuminates, its new context within the narrative), the motif of the Righteous Sufferer in Mark's gospel, and an exegesis of Ps 22 in Mark's passion-resurrection narrative.

The composition of this study will be comprised of the presentation of several independent strands of evidence that support the argument that Mark's first-century implied readers would have interpreted the citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 in light of the entire psalm (contextually), and that Mark's narrative is designed in such a way as to guide them in this interpretation. The advantage of this strategy is two-fold. Since no one argument depends upon another, (1) a foundational relationship between each argument is not necessary, i. e., one argument does not build upon another, but instead maintains its relevance individually insofar as it contributes toward the thesis above; and therefore (2) the reader can disagree with any one strand of the evidence considered and still be convinced by the overall argument. For example, the reader of this study might not be convinced that Jesus is presented as a Righteous Sufferer figure in Mark's gospel (Chapter 6), yet may be convinced of the larger thesis based on other arguments presented, such as the contextual use of the scriptures throughout Mark's narrative (Chapter 4). These

individual strands of evidence stand alone and thus contribute to the web of argumentation that is constructed throughout this study in support of a contextual reading of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34.

The Trajectory of this Study

After a methodological discussion of intertextuality in **Chapter 2**, each strand of evidence will be presented in the following order. In **Chapter 3**, the importance of the resurrection in Mark's narrative will be highlighted, as a counterbalance to the predominant view that Mark is concerned only with Jesus' suffering and death. This is presented as a support for the thesis as it shows that the element of vindication at the end of Ps 22 is not at odds with the Markan interest in Jesus' vindication via resurrection, but indeed complements his (Mark) own narrative emphases. In **Chapter 4** I will examine Mark's use of the scriptures in general, with a view toward whether he most often cites or alludes to these texts atomistically or contextually. If it can be shown that Mark often cites or alludes to scripture contextually, then there is a more firm basis for arguing that he does so in Mark 15:34. In **Chapter 5** the focus will shift to issues outside of the gospel of Mark such as the presence of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer during the first century C.E. and the liturgical and textual use of the psalms (and Ps 22 specifically). If it can be shown that similar interpretations of Ps 22 and applications of the Righteous Sufferer motif were "in the air" of Mark's socio-cultural milieu, then it increases the likelihood that Mark made use of these in his own narrative and that his implied readers would have recognized and interpreted it accordingly. **Chapter 6** will examine the Markan narrative to see if Jesus is indeed presented as a Righteous Sufferer figure, and whether or not Mark's use of Ps 22 is pressed into the service of this motif. A detailed exegesis of Mark's use of Ps 22 and especially the citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 will be the subject of discussion in **Chapter 7**. After a brief reiteration of the evidence in **Chapter 8**, my thesis will then be put to the test. In **Chapter 9** I will treat Matthew and Luke as our earliest tangible first-century readers, studying their own passion-resurrection narratives for evidence of how they both adopted and adapted Mark's own use of Ps 22 and the Righteous Sufferer motif. The goal of this exercise is to see if Mark's earliest implied readers may indeed have interpreted his citation and allusions to Ps 22 contextually, i.e., whether they were likely to have picked up on the clues in his gospel which I have argued are indications that the whole psalm is in view in the citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34.

Assumptions and Limitations of this Study

1. The priority of Mark will be assumed.
2. In keeping with a narrative-critical methodology, this study will avoid making comparisons between Mark and the other works of the NT, being concerned primarily with how Mark constructs his Jesus story, irrespective of how the other gospel writers agree or differ. One noticeable exception from this rule will entail an examination of how Matthew and Luke adopted and adapted Mark's use of Ps 22 as our clearest example of early Christian readers. However, the results of this investigation will be considered *support* for the evidence previously presented and *not* as further primary evidence which should effect one's interpretation of Mark 15:34.
3. Also consistent with narrative criticism, this work will not be engaged with the reconstruction of the "original" text of the Gospel of Mark, but will address the form of the text found in NA²⁷. Text critical issues will be dealt with as needed on a case-by-case basis.
4. Historical Jesus matters will not be addressed in this study.⁴⁸
5. "Mark" is used to refer to the author of the second gospel, and does not imply anything about his identity.
6. Along with the majority of Markan scholars, this study will assume that Mark did indeed have a "community" to which he wrote. This does not, however, imply that his gospel was written for or read *exclusively* by his community. This study does not intend to present a comprehensive portrait of this Markan community, but rather to understand how this community would have read and understood Mark 15:34. All descriptions of these readers and their audience will aim toward this goal.

⁴⁸ Although it may be claimed that, if the historical Jesus uttered only the first verse of the psalm, then, (a) this would necessarily indicate only despair on his part; and (b) this would thus be an issue that must be addressed in this study (as it could be detrimental to my thesis), I do not think a discussion of the historical Jesus and Mark 15:34 is required for the following reasons: (1) questions concerning the historical Jesus would not be consistent with the methodology used in this study, which is narrative-critical and not purely historical-critical (although some historical questions will be asked); (2) the focus of this study is on how *Mark* intends the citation to be understood, not the historical Jesus; (3) there is no way to determine if the historical Jesus actually uttered this citation; (4) even if Jesus uttered only the first verse of the psalm, it does not necessarily indicate only despair. If Mark could cite this verse contextually, so could the historical Jesus!

7. In order to be consistent with first-century Jewish and Christian practice, the deity will be referred to by default in the masculine. Similarly, the author of Mark will be referred to in the masculine, since it is overwhelmingly agreed that, in the first-century Greco-Roman culture, only males received adequate training in composition.
8. Joining the consensus of Markan scholarship, I regard the authentic ending of Mark to be located at Mark 16:8.

Chapter 2

Intertextuality, Citation, and Allusion

As indicated from the introductory chapter, the term “intertextuality” will be used throughout this study to describe the relationship between the citation and allusions to Ps 22 and Mark’s narrative. To speak of Ps 22 as an “intertext” of Mark means that the author of the gospel has incorporated at least some aspects of the psalm into his own narrative, adopting and adapting these allusions and citation to suit his own purposes.

Before turning our attention to how Mark uses Ps 22 as one of his intertexts, we must first address the more theoretical issue of intertextuality within literary criticism, and then ask whether intertextuality is an appropriate and relevant category within biblical studies in general, as this has been recently disputed by some scholars. This will lead to a discussion of two specific categories within intertextuality: citation and allusion. I will end this introductory chapter by presenting my own criteria for determining scriptural allusions.

Intertextuality in Literary Criticism and Biblical Studies

The term “intertextuality” has generated a lively discussion within both literary criticism and biblical studies. Coined in the French intellectual scene of the 1960s by Julia Kristeva, much of the dialogue has centered on the meaning of the term, the role of the author, the reader, and the texts themselves, and the influence of texts on each other.⁴⁹ “Intertextuality” has become such a fluid term since the time of its conception that one is hard-pressed to find even two identical definitions. This is most evident when one examines how the term is used differently in other disciplines, but this is true even within literary criticism. M. Orr, a scholar of French literature, bemoans the fact that for most novices and scholars alike (of intertextuality in literary criticism), the “intertextuality” of Barthes, Riffaterre, and Genette passes for the original Kristevan appropriation of the term, when in fact their respective

⁴⁹ Julia Kristeva, *Séméiotiké: recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris: Points, 1969). The other “founding fathers” of intertextuality include: Roland Barthes, Michael Riffaterre, and Gérard Genette.

“intertextualities” are really quite their own versions.⁵⁰ In other words, Kristeva’s intertextuality is rarely read on its own terms.

Part of the confusion may stem from the fact that, although it was Kristeva who first coined the term, it was Roland Barthes who first provided an expanded definition of it within the entry on “Texte (théorie du)” in the *Encyclopédie universalis* in 1973.⁵¹ Despite the fact that he traverses away from Kristeva’s “intertextuality” in his other writings, Orr points out that in this definition Barthes remains quite faithful to the Kristevan intertextuality of *Séméiotiké*. Below is the section most relevant for the purposes of this study:

The text deconstructs the language of communication, representation or expression . . . and reconstructs another language. . . . Every text is an intertext; other texts are present within it to varying degrees and in more or less recognizable forms. . . . Every text is a new tissue of recycled citations. . . . The intertext is a field of anonymous formulae whose origin is rarely recoverable, of unconscious or automatic citations without speech marks.⁵²

Other definitions and nuances of intertextuality abound in current literary studies. For T. Schaub, the term is to be understood apart from “allusion,” as primarily historical, cultural, and unintentional (whereas allusions are ahistorical, not necessarily culture-specific, and intentional).⁵³ According to J. Culler, intertextuality is “not the investigation of sources and influences as traditionally conceived; it casts its net wider to include anonymous discursive practices, codes whose origins are lost, that make possible the signifying practices of later texts.”⁵⁴ For Culler the function of intertextuality is two-fold: (1) to call attention to the importance of antecedent texts in order to reemphasize the nonexistence of autonomous texts; and (2) to remind the reader that those prior texts are rooted and participate in discourse with a specific culture. S. Hinds struggles with an attempt to understand a more balanced

⁵⁰ Mary Orr, *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003).

⁵¹ Another factor is that, even now, Kristeva’s works are only partially translated into English, whereas the works of the other French scholars are all available in English.

⁵² Orr, *Intertextuality*, 33, her translation.

⁵³ Thomas Schaub, “Allusion and Intertext: History in *The End of the Road*,” in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (ed. J. Clayton and E. Rothstein; Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 181-203.

⁵⁴ Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1981), 103.

intertextual relationship between the agency of the author and reader, rather than privileging one over the other.⁵⁵

Even within literary studies the concept of intertextuality has morphed into influence studies (Bloom) and an emphasis on allusions (Schaub, Hinds, Hollander).⁵⁶ Given this diversity, it should come as no surprise that the term has come to mean something quite distinct and specific within biblical studies. Within NT studies, intertextuality has come to refer generally to the use of the scriptures by NT writers, whether explicitly (citation) or implicitly (allusion, echo).

In the introductory essay of his edited volume on the use of the scriptures in the NT, S. Moyise credits two works for bringing the concept of intertextuality to biblical studies: S. Draisma's *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings* and Richard Hays' *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*.⁵⁷ In Draisma's volume, W. Vorster's focus is on highlighting what he believes intertextuality brings to the discipline that redaction history does not.⁵⁸ Hays' examination of some of the "echoes" of the scriptures in Paul's writings relies on Hollander's study of echoes, which focuses less on the design of the author to allude to things, but rather on the effects "produced for those who have ears to hear."⁵⁹ In their essay on the use of the scriptures by NT writers, Hays and J. Green adopt M. Foucault's concept of intertextuality which sees every text as being part of a large "network" of texts, consisting of and participating in the interplay with those other texts.⁶⁰ In the specific case of the NT use of the

⁵⁵ Stephen Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

⁵⁶ Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973); Schaub, "Allusion"; Hinds, *Allusion*; John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).

⁵⁷ Steve Moyise, "Intertextuality and the Study of the OT in the NT," in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North* (ed. S. Moyise; JSNTSup 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 14. Sipke Draisma, ed., *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings* (Kampen: Kok, 1989); Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

⁵⁸ Willem S. Vorster, "Intertextuality and Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings* (ed. S. Draisma; Kampen: Kok, 1989), 15-26. For Vorster, intertextuality, (a) redefines "text" as a network of other texts; (b) focuses attention on the process of production of a text, as opposed to the sources and influences behind the text; and (c) reserves a place for the role of the reader, where redaction-criticism does not (21).

⁵⁹ Hays, *Echoes*, 19. Since Hays' use of intertextuality deals with the more specific aspect of allusion, we will leave our discussion of his work for the following section.

⁶⁰ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (London: Tavistock, 1972).

scriptures, the various allusions within a text bring its hearers into “a kind of echo chamber so as to hear in the current text reverberations of other texts.”⁶¹

There are, however, at least two dissenting voices within biblical studies which contest the wholesale appropriation of the term to the specific issue of the NT writers’ use of the scriptures, although the conclusions each reaches are quite different.

Perhaps the most ardent rejection of the appropriateness of the term for biblical studies comes from T. Hatina. He argues that, given the poststructuralist context from which “intertextuality” originated, it is an inappropriate term for the enterprise to which it is applied in biblical studies, specifically that of historical-criticism.⁶² He offers three problematic characteristics of intertextuality which historical critics have failed to recognize in their appropriation of the term to the NT: (1) the ideological context from which the term arose (poststructuralist); (2) the concept of “text” within this context; and (3) the distinction between “influence” and intertextuality. Concerning the first characteristic, Hatina argues that the ideological/political agenda of Kristeva (to gain control over texts in an attempt to subvert the bourgeois class by empowering the reader to resist literary and social tradition) is inherent within the concept of intertextuality itself, as is its relationship to deconstruction. This ideology is fully incompatible with historical-critical enterprises in biblical studies. His argument is worth quoting at length:

Intertextuality supplants traditional models of influence which have been basic to the humanistic tradition of learning. It radically transforms the premises upon which literature had been studied and conceptualized. The major premises which are discarded include: (1) the potential of language to create stable meaning; (2) the existence of meaning within established forms; (3) the artist’s control of meaning; (4) a work’s closure and (5) the ancillary activity of criticism as separate from literature. . . . Since historical critics fall

⁶¹ Richard B. Hays and Joel B. Green, “The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers,” in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (ed. J. Green; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 228. For examples of this type of intertextuality “in action,” cf. Hays’ *Echoes*; Steve Moyise, ed., *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Gail R. O’Day, “Jeremiah 9:22-23 and 1 Corinthians 1:26-31: A Study in Intertextuality,” *JBL* 109 (1990): 259-67.

⁶² Hatina, Thomas R., “Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?,” *BibInt* 7 (1999): 28-43.

within the traditional model of learning, their appropriation of 'intertextuality' clearly differs on every point. Ironically, the appropriation of the term 'intertextuality' by historical critics violates one of the major tenets of historical criticism, namely a sensitivity to context. In this case, the context is the political and ideological framework that gave intertextuality its distinctive meaning.⁶³

In other words, historical critics who adopt this term are ignoring the very context from which "intertextuality" emerged!

Hatina also argues that the open-endedness of a text (according to poststructuralist intertextuality) is fundamentally contrary to the enterprise of historical-criticism, because one cannot "decode" texts. In addition, there is no room for regarding the text as made up of cause and effect structures. Thirdly, the focus on the reader and the reader's own intertext is antithetical to historical-criticism's focus on the author and the written text. However, Hatina does see in this last point a redeemable feature for historical-criticism: even if it is limited only to self-analysis, the discipline needs to be aware of the fact that a reader does bring a plurality of texts to his/her interpretation of a text.⁶⁴

Hatina also calls for recognition among historical-critical scholars of the difference between intertextuality and influence. He regards the "intertextuality" of historical-criticism to be synonymous with source-influence studies, and therefore regards the name "intertextuality" to bring, in essence, nothing new to the discipline except confusion.⁶⁵ Toward the end of his essay, Hatina softens his critique by acknowledging that there are some literary critics who seem to be aware of this problem and seek to claim the term "intertextuality" for themselves and to subvert the ideological influence of the term from which it originated.⁶⁶ Thus, he states that if historical critics want to use this term, they should enter into this recent discussion, or at least become familiar with it.

In the introductory article to the volume of *Semeia* devoted entirely to the subject of intertextuality, G. Aichele and G. A. Phillips argue that the term can be

⁶³ Hatina, "Intertextuality," 31-32.

⁶⁴ Hatina, "Intertextuality," 35.

⁶⁵ Hatina, "Intertextuality," 36-37, critiques Hays at this point.

⁶⁶ Hatina, "Intertextuality," 37. Unfortunately, he doesn't cite any of the literary critics he has in mind.

redeemed for the discipline if it ceases to be used as a restrictive device for understanding authorial intent and literary influence.⁶⁷ Instead, they regard the advantage of intertextuality in biblical studies in its being a way of “opening up cultural and ethical issues.”⁶⁸ So, for them, intertextuality is primarily a cultural and ethical matter, as the culture and ethics of the NT world clash with the culture and ethics of the contemporary reader’s world. Therefore, intertextuality has to do with the biblical text and the world of the reader, as opposed to the traditional understanding of intertextuality as dealing with the scriptures and extra-canonical world/text and the NT world/text.

Intertextuality also provides a way for the reader to detect the ideological agenda of the writer, and encourages a “rethinking of the privileged notions of authorial consciousness and intentionality.”⁶⁹ Thus, by deleting the distinctions between “inside” and “outside” the text, intertextuality challenges the common notions of exegesis and eisegesis, rendering interpretation subjective and dependent upon the ideologies and cultural/social background of the reader/interpreter.⁷⁰ Aichele and Phillips’ “intertextuality,” then, serves a reader-oriented interpretation rather than an author-oriented or even text-oriented reading of the text.

Given the arguments above, is “intertextuality” indeed an appropriate term to be used in describing the relationship between the scriptures and the NT? Once intertextuality is removed from its poststructuralist context, does it have any meaning? Does it contribute to the discussion of the use of the scriptures in the NT, or is it merely superfluous? I believe that the term can be salvaged for use in this context. Several responses can be made to the above protestations.

Although the term “intertextuality” did indeed originate in a poststructuralist context, one whose ideology is in many ways antithetical to the enterprise of biblical studies, its definition and application has not strictly adhered to its Kristevan use. Orr’s work on the subject is helpful in this regard, as it shows that even within a poststructuralist context the term has been used in a variety of ways to mean a variety

⁶⁷ George Aichele and Gary A. Phillips, “Introduction: Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis,” *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 7-18. They list George Buchanan (*Introduction to Intertextuality* [Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1994]), S. Draisma, and Hays as perpetrators of this type of intertextuality.

⁶⁸ Aichele and Phillips, “Introduction,” 13. They mention as an example the way intertextuality provides the ability to read against the anti-Semitic text of Matthew.

⁶⁹ Aichele and Phillips, “Introduction,” 13-14.

⁷⁰ Aichele and Phillips, “Introduction,” 14-15.

of things. Thus, even in literary criticism, intertextuality is a fluid concept, and one that is adapted and nuanced according to the new context in which it is used. An interest in the role of the author, for instance, is not absent even in the discipline of literary studies.⁷¹ If there is such diversity in the application and appropriation of the term within its immediate family, one should not be quick to condemn another variant as it appears in a separate discipline such as biblical studies.

Moyise has offered a nuanced definition of intertextuality precisely to avoid these poststructuralist connotations when appropriating it for the study of the relationship between the scriptures and the NT. This involves three subcategories of the term.⁷² *Intertextual echo* tries to show that an allusion can be more important than its appearance suggests. *Dialogical intertextuality* refers to the interaction between two texts that seems to go both ways.⁷³ *Postmodern intertextuality* asserts that there is never only one way to read a text, and this type of intertextuality aims to show the price that is paid for each meaning that is selected. It is this poststructuralist version with which the intertextuality of biblical studies has the least in common. Moyise's categories underscore the existence of a variety of definitions of intertextuality, and help to distinguish the intertextuality which concerns the relationship between the scriptures and the NT from other types.

Does the open-endedness and infiniteness of a text (according to the classic poststructuralist definition of intertextuality) make it inimical to the historical-critical enterprise in biblical studies, which seeks to "decode" the text? Perhaps. Increasingly in biblical studies, however, those who embrace the concept of intertextuality are not primarily concerned with historical-critical issues, *per se*, but are rather concerned with either a narrative-critical approach, or a reader-centered approach to the text.⁷⁴ In this case, meaning is not restricted to intention behind the text, but is rather found within (narrative) or in front of (reader-response) the text. In response to Aichele and Phillip's criticism of using the term to refer to the use of the scriptures in the NT, I

⁷¹ See Bloom, *Anxiety*.

⁷² Moyise, "Intertextuality," 17-18.

⁷³ Moyise, "Intertextuality," 17, gives an example from the Corinthian epistles, where the early church wants to claim that Jesus' life and death is a fulfilment of the scriptures (1 Cor 15:3-4), yet it also wants to claim that it is only in Christ that the scriptures find their true meaning (2 Cor 3:15).

⁷⁴ For example, James W. Voelz, "Multiple Signs, Levels of Meaning and Self as Text: Elements of Intertextuality," *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 149-64; Aichele and Williams, "Introduction."

would argue that a narrative-critical methodology does indeed leave room for “intertextuality” to be used in this way, and also leaves open the possibility for the two cultural “worlds” of the text and the contemporary reader to dialogue concerning the issues to which the text guides the reader’s attention. In other words, the way in which a narrative might encourage the type of intertextuality defined by Aichele and Phillips is precisely to participate in the more common definition of intertextuality, i.e. using the scriptures to illumine the NT narrative. Thus, a definition of intertextuality that sees the intertexts as those of the NT world and the contemporary reader’s world is a possible one, but not the only one, nor the necessary one.

In the case of a narrative-critical methodology (as in this study), if one is consistent with the emphasis on the immediate context as the primary “tool” of interpretation, then the context within which “intertextuality” is now used becomes key, and thus its new definition can subvert the original use of the term in post-structuralism. Although he makes concessions for the possible appropriateness of the term “intertextuality” in areas outside of historical-criticism, (and only then if it is defined against its original context), in practice it appears that Hatina is reluctant to condone even this. In his later book, *In Search of a Context*, Hatina resists using the term even though his methodological approach is predominantly narrative-critical.⁷⁵

Why use “intertextuality” in biblical studies? Intertextuality is a helpful term because the connotation of the term itself suggests its reference to the study of use of the scriptures within the NT, as Hatina rightly points out.⁷⁶ Regardless of its origin, intertextuality has come to have significant meaning within NT studies specifically, as a helpful way to refer to the relationship between the scriptures and the NT. It appears that the term has been sufficiently appropriated and so overwhelmingly embraced in biblical studies that the only way to move is forward. It is in this sense that the present study will use “intertextuality,” as a way of referring to the use of the scriptures by NT writers, and more specifically, the use of Ps 22 by Mark.

⁷⁵ Hatina, *Search*, 5.

⁷⁶ Hatina, “Intertextuality,” 42, states that this convenience of terminology concerning the study of the scriptures and the NT accounts for the shift in meaning from literary to biblical studies.

Allusion in Literary Criticism and Biblical Studies

If the discussion concerning intertextuality has been a lively one in literary studies, this can also be said of the concept of allusion. The interests of several literary scholars will first be briefly summarized in order to provide a context for the issues regarding allusion that have concerned the discipline in recent decades. This will be helpful because it will set the stage for a comparison between the issues that occupy the attention of literary scholars and those that predominate in biblical studies. It will become clear that the concerns of NT scholars, who adopt the language of allusion primarily to refer to the less overt references to the scriptures in the NT, and who are concerned to set forth the criteria for distinguishing allusions from non-allusions, are quite different from those of literary critics.

In her essay “On Alluding,” C. Perri is primarily concerned with disputing the common definition of allusion as “reference” by distinguishing between the two.⁷⁷ She notes that in an allusion the reader is not expected to bring all of the characteristics of the object of the allusion to bear on its new context. Rather, it is the context that guides the reader in discerning which aspects of the object are applicable and which are not.⁷⁸ Her concern is in looking beyond the “primary level of operation in alluding” to the deeper secondary significances able to be discerned once the primary (surface) significance is grasped.⁷⁹ She concentrates her attention on allusions to characters, noting that these allusions move beyond the literal words of the referent (reference) to the denotation of certain attributes of a character, these attributes being specified by the new context.⁸⁰

According to Perri, the aspects of a successful allusion (one from which the audience benefits) are: recognition (that the allusion is an echo of a former text), realization (that meaning goes beyond the mere recognition of the former text, and that construal is required), remembrance (of the relevant aspects of the former text), and connection (of one or more of these aspects with the new context in order to complete the meaning of the allusion).⁸¹ She concludes her essay by categorizing

⁷⁷ Carmela Perri, “On Alluding,” *Poetics* 7 (1978): 289-307.

⁷⁸ Perri, “On Alluding,” 291-92.

⁷⁹ Perri, “On Alluding,” 293.

⁸⁰ Perri, “On Alluding,” 297-98.

⁸¹ Perri, “On Alluding,” 301.

three types of allusions: proper naming (including the name of a character in order to allude to one or more of his/her attributes), definite description (brief allusions), and paraphrase (an extended definite description).⁸²

J. Coombs sets out on an ambitious undertaking when he seeks to provide a theory that is inclusive of all allusions, not just literary ones.⁸³ He sees in allusion a two-step implicative process. Like Perri, he is also concerned to emphasize that allusion goes beyond mere reference (the first step), that it involves an implication or implications that are not included in the words themselves (the second step).⁸⁴ In other words, inherent in the concept of allusion is the need for interpretation of the allusion itself.⁸⁵ For the effect of the allusion to be successful, mere identification is not enough. This may seem like a basic assertion and one that can be assumed, but it is not. What is important to glean from Coomb's observation for our purposes is the very nature of allusion to point beyond itself. Where and how far an allusion points is of great concern in the latter sections of this chapter.

In his article, "Limits of Allusion," M. Leddy seeks to narrow the concept of allusion by distinguishing it in such a way as to preserve its meaningfulness as a literary device.⁸⁶ He argues that some definitions of allusion are so generic as to take away any distinguishing characteristics until it becomes nothing more than a speech act.⁸⁷ The first limit is that of subject matter. An allusion must be defined as something more than shared language or tradition, and it must have the possibility of being missed by some and recognized by others. Thus, an allusion cannot be something that is so widely shared that everyone will pick up on it.⁸⁸ A second limit of allusion is that it usually invokes associations with cultural aspects and brings them to bear on its new context.⁸⁹ A third limit of allusion is the inclusion of

⁸² Perri, "On Alluding," 304.

⁸³ James H. Coombs, "Allusion Defined and Explained," *Poetics* 13 (1984): 475-88.

⁸⁴ Coombs, "Allusion," 481.

⁸⁵ Coombs, "Allusion," 480.

⁸⁶ Michael Leddy, "Limits of Allusion," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 32 (1992): 110-22.

⁸⁷ Leddy, "Limits," 110.

⁸⁸ Leddy, "Limits," 111-12. Leddy underscores this point by reminding the reader that the language most often used with regard to allusions is not "speaking" or "hearing," but "discovering, finding, identifying, or spotting them."

⁸⁹ Leddy, "Limits," 112.

“allusion-words,” words that make up a portion of the allusion to which the reader can point as the core of significance.⁹⁰

G. Hermerén’s work on literary allusion is distinctive in that one of his main concerns is to determine which characteristics make an allusion successful, i.e. understood by the reader.⁹¹ He lists several factors that may contribute to the contingency of a reader’s recognition and understanding of an allusion. These include the literary competence of the reader, the assumptions of the reader (concerning literary traditions, works, and tropes), the historical and biographical assumptions of the reader concerning the author of the text, the assumptions of the genre of the work, and the assumptions about the function of literary criticism and interpretation itself.⁹² Hermerén is also concerned with the role of intention in allusion. He argues that there is a place for speaking of an author’s intention because texts themselves do not allude.⁹³ He qualifies this by distinguishing between the type of intention that is construed as a mental state (the “intention” of which the term “intentional fallacy” originated⁹⁴), and the intention as a disposition. It is the latter definition which he finds the most helpful and tangible when dealing with allusions.⁹⁵

Of the recent studies on allusion in literary criticism, Hermerén’s seems to come the closest to presenting some basic criteria for allusions, although it is not what most biblical scholars look for in criteria. His loose definition of allusion is worth quoting in full:

To say that an artist or writer alludes to another work of art in one of his own works is to say or imply that he intends those who look at his work to recall the other work and therefore creates his work with *features* reminiscent of the other work; and because his work has these *features*, beholders will . . . come

⁹⁰ Leddy, “Limits,” 113.

⁹¹ Göran Hermerén, “Allusions and Intentions,” in *Intention and Interpretation* (ed. G. Iseminger; Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992), 203-220.

⁹² Hermerén, “Allusions,” 217-18.

⁹³ Hermerén, “Allusions,” 216. He is here resisting the temptation to dehumanize the process of allusion by firmly attributing the alluding to an author rather than speaking of “textual intent.”

⁹⁴ W. K. Wimsatt and Monroe C. Beardsley, “The Intentional Fallacy” in *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry* (Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky Press, 1954) 3-18.

⁹⁵ Hermerén, “Allusions,” 217.

to think of the earlier work; furthermore, they will recognize that this is what the artist, among other things, wanted them to do.⁹⁶

Unfortunately, Hermerén does not articulate what precisely are these “features,” which seem to be the very “criteria” which biblical scholars have long sought and continue to seek. On the following page, however, he does list style, form, structure, function, meaning, and aesthetic features as general aspects that the reader must recognize as being shared between the alluding work and the work to which it alludes.⁹⁷

From our brief synopsis of the study of allusion in literary studies, it has become clear that its concern is quite different from that of biblical studies. Of utmost interest is the setting out of a definition of an allusion, either by defining what it is or distinguishing it from what it is not, rather than the setting out of criteria needed to determine an allusion within a body of work. It is the theory behind allusion that is the point of contention in literary studies. One is hard-pressed to find the literary critic who disputes another critic’s labeling of a word or sentence as an allusion, unlike in NT studies, where disputations over allusions are commonplace. Why the difference? Perhaps it is because, in some instances, the faith aspect of reading scripture (as opposed to Chaucer or *Finnegans Wake*) places a greater stake on interpretation. The more likely reason is that the predominantly historical-critical perspective that has dominated biblical studies for so long (even those who do not profess to be historical-critics *per se*, are often still interested in historical-critical issues as a way of understanding the text in terms of agency, or textual intention⁹⁸) has privileged the meaning of the text that is found in the intention of the author, which requires a criterion with which to distinguish “real” allusions from contrived ones. This is a concern that is generally absent in literary criticism.⁹⁹ Regardless of the reasoning, in current NT studies a search for these elusive criteria of allusion is of primary importance. It is to this contentious subject that we now turn.

⁹⁶ Hermerén, “Allusions,” 212. Italics are mine.

⁹⁷ Hermerén, “Allusions,” 213.

⁹⁸ By “agency” or “textual intention,” I mean the intent of the implied author, as much as can be determined by the texts that we now have.

⁹⁹ Even the interest in authorial intention found in literary studies is very different from that found in biblical studies. For example, Hermerén, “Allusions,” 209, speaks out against over-emphasizing the type of intention often sought by modern biblical scholars.

Perhaps the most explosive discussion on allusion to arrive on the recent biblical studies scene was R. Hays' book on allusion in Paul's epistles. Highly influenced by Hollander's work on echoes in Milton, Hays' objective is to cultivate a "sensitivity" for discovering allusions to the scriptures in Paul, rather than to set out a stringent method for doing so.¹⁰⁰ He distinguishes between citation, allusion, and echo by picturing them on a continuum from the explicit to the implicit. The less overt the allusion, the more likely the reader will not recognize it as such, and the "demand placed on the reader's listening powers grows greater."¹⁰¹ For Hays, the difference between an allusion and an echo is that "allusion" is reserved for obvious intertextual references, while "echo" refers to subtler ones.¹⁰²

Rather than privileging the intention of the author or the reader's recognition in order to legitimate a possible allusion within a text, Hays opts to hold these in tension, arguing that claims of intertextuality are the strongest when it is consistent with the literary flow and structure of the text, and when it appears to be both intended by the author and within the reading competence of first-century readers.¹⁰³ His criteria for detecting echoes¹⁰⁴ are: availability, volume (prominence in the text, rhetorical force), recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation (have other scholars seen these echoes?), and satisfaction (Does this reading make sense and does it "illuminate the surrounding discourse"?).¹⁰⁵ It is this last criterion which is the most subjective, and yet the most interesting and helpful for my discussion of allusion in Mark.

Another Pauline scholar, M. Thompson, distinguishes between citation, allusion, and echo in a similar manner, and sets out several "tests" for determining allusions within a biblical text.¹⁰⁶ These include verbal agreement,¹⁰⁷ conceptual

¹⁰⁰ Hays, *Echoes*, 21.

¹⁰¹ Hays, *Echoes*, 23.

¹⁰² Hays, *Echoes*, 29.

¹⁰³ Hays, *Echoes*, 28.

¹⁰⁴ Hays, *Echoes*, 29. His tests for echoes can be applied to allusions depending on one's definition of the latter term.

¹⁰⁵ Hays, *Echoes*, 29-32.

¹⁰⁶ Michael Thompson, *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1-15.13* (JSNTSup 59; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).

agreement,¹⁰⁸ formal agreement (i.e., structure), the presence of tradition indicators,¹⁰⁹ the likelihood that the author knew the saying, and the exegetical value of the supposed allusion.¹¹⁰

In his essay on the use of Zechariah in the gospel of Matthew, P. Foster's discussion concerning what makes an allusion, and whether "allusion" terminology is either accurate or helpful sets the foundation for Foster's conclusions about the use of Zechariah in Matthew.¹¹¹ He, along with Thompson, draws on Perri's basic criteria of the aspects of a successful allusion (recognition, realization, remembrance, and connection).¹¹² In essence, Foster requires verbal affinity (not just any words in common, but distinctive words) for a claim that an NT passage is dependent upon a scriptural passage to be accurate.

This brief summary of important work done on the issue of scriptural allusion in the NT has highlighted some key aspects of the current discussion on the topic.¹¹³ Those few who have set out to establish criteria for determining allusions have done so in a similar fashion with similar results, although with varying degrees of restrictiveness. Most scholars do not attempt to produce a list of criteria such as Hays and Thompson have presented, instead preferring to move directly to an

¹⁰⁷ Thompson, *Clothed*, 31. He notes that if, by using shared vocabulary, this is the only way that the author could have expressed his argument or thought, then the strength of the parallel is weakened.

¹⁰⁸ Thompson, *Clothed*, 32. He qualifies this by noting that the author could have included the allusion to have the opposite effect, i.e. for antithesis or contrast.

¹⁰⁹ Thompson, *Clothed*, 34. For example, a disturbance in grammar or syntax from the surrounding context, new stylistic features like parallelism, chiasm, the inclusion of an introductory particle or formulae, or the interruption of the flow of the story.

¹¹⁰ See Thompson, *Clothed*, 31-36, for his entire list of tests. The criteria included above are only those which are directly relevant to the study of Mark (as opposed to the Pauline epistles).

¹¹¹ Paul Foster, "The Use of Zechariah in Matthew's Gospel," in *The Book of Zechariah and Its Influence* (ed. C. Tuckett; Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2003), 65-85.

¹¹² Foster, "Use," 65-66; Perri, "On Alluding," 301.

¹¹³ A Markan scholar who has done rather unique work on allusion and the gospel of Mark is Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000). He argues that Mark's primary intertexts were the Homeric epics. His criteria for allusions are: (1) accessibility (Did the author have access to these texts?); (2) analogy (Did other authors pattern their characters after those in this text?); (3) density (How many times does this text appear to be alluded to or cited?); (4) order (Is there a similar sequence in parallels?); (5) distinctiveness (Do the two texts share rare or peculiar components?); and (6) interpretability (Does the intertext make sense of the latter text?). Although perhaps influenced by these popular texts, the prevalence of allusions to the scriptures in Mark seems to counter MacDonald's claim that Jesus was primarily modelled after Homer's protagonist Odysseus.

examination and/or debate of specific passages.¹¹⁴ It should also be noted that most of the groundwork done on citation and allusion in the NT has been done by Pauline scholars.¹¹⁵ Even those scholars who provide their own criteria for allusions in the gospels rely heavily on the previous work of Hays, et al.¹¹⁶

Might there be room for a differentiation between the criteria of allusion in the gospels and those in the epistles? The issue of genre in the discussion of allusion and intertextuality in biblical studies has not yet, to my knowledge, come to the fore.¹¹⁷ It seems to me, however, that inherent in the genre of narrative is a wider possibility for the inclusion of allusions.¹¹⁸ This is due to the elements of a narrative such as plot, setting, and character development, elements which are less cultivated in a genre such as an epistle, which relies more on explicit rhetoric and argument than story. In a narrative, an author can make an allusion to a certain person by enrobing his/her main character with a characteristic of that person or by placing that character in similar circumstances. This may or may not include shared vocabulary, since the author has more room to place his/her protagonist in shared or similar circumstances with that of the person to which he alludes.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁴ For example, O'Day, "Jeremiah 9:22-23," 259-67; John S. Kloppenborg, "Isa 5:1-7 LXX and Mark 12:1, 9, Again," *NovT* 46 (2004):12-19.

¹¹⁵ See Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Christopher D. Stanley, "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations in the New Testament," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1997), 18-27; as well as Hays, *Echoes*; Thompson, *Clothed*.

¹¹⁶ For example, Foster, "Use," and Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark* (WUNT 8; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1997).

¹¹⁷ Paul R. Noble, "Esau, Tamar, and Joseph: Criteria for Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions" *VT* 52 (2002): 219-252, makes a passing statement concerning this issue, namely that there is room for further intertextual affinities in the genre of narrative based on plot and characterization, 221. I believe that the discussions of "inner-biblical exegesis" in Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), and "type-scenes" in Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981), implicitly confirm this argument for the flexibility of allusion in biblical narrative.

¹¹⁸ Do literary critics distinguish between allusion in prose/narrative and allusion in poetry? This is difficult to answer because the lines between narrative and poetry are not always easily drawn, as is exemplified in the case of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, which can be classified as both poetry and narrative. All of my efforts to find a literary critic who draws a distinction between the two came up short.

¹¹⁹ Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 11-22, appears to be moving in this direction when he discusses the ways that allusions might appear in a text, even using the term "similar circumstances" to refer to the recalling of a similar, previous event in a later text (19). He does not, however, discuss the role that genre might play in allowing this

An example of this in Mark's gospel can be found in the story of the calming of the storm (4:35-41). Scholars have acknowledged here an allusion to the Jonah story, specifically noting the similarity between Mark 4:37, 38 and LXX Jonah 1:4-6.¹²⁰ On the grounds of *distinctive* shared vocabulary alone, one would have to dismiss this as an allusion, since the two passages share only forms of μέγας, πλοῖον, γινομαι, and καθεύδω, words none of which are particularly distinctive. Yet the setting in which the two main characters (Jonah and Jesus) find themselves is strangely similar (in a boat in the middle of a storm, with fellow travelers who are afraid), as is their actions during the storm (sleeping) and their respective roles as authoritative figures. In addition, Mark uses several different words to describe similar circumstances, such as for λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου "storm of wind" (instead of πνεῦμα κλύδων) and for ἐγείρουσιν "waking up" (instead of ἀνάστα). Does this lack of distinctive shared vocabulary mean that Mark is not alluding to the Jonah story in this passage? I would argue that the similarity of setting and characterization indicates that Mark is indeed alluding to this story, perhaps to draw a contrast between the powerlessness of Jonah in the face of God's power, and the powerfulness of Jesus as one who, along with God, can control the sea. This is further substantiated by the fact that Mark uses vocabulary that belongs in the same semantic domain as key words in the Jonah account. It is precisely the narrative aspects of setting, plot, and characterization that allow Mark room to present and the reader to recognize the allusion to the scriptures in this miracle story. The Jonah story thus becomes a paradigm for this account in Mark's Jesus story.

My own criteria for intertextual allusions are greatly influenced by the works of the biblical scholars which I have discussed above, yet is nuanced in light of my observations concerning the more flexible nature of the genre of narrative to leave room for a less restricted concept of intertextuality. The definition of allusion that the literary critic Hermerén offers is helpful for this study, as it focuses on the importance of the presence of recognizable features from the intertext, as well as the role that the implied reader plays in identifying the shared features in both texts.¹²¹ This definition helps to emphasize the role of the implied reader in interpreting these

type of flexibility. Allison's discussion is limited to the allusive strategy of typology alone, and is thus not inclusive of other forms of allusion. For this reason, a more thorough discussion of his method will not be included here.

¹²⁰ See NA²⁷.

¹²¹ Hermerén, "Allusions," 212.

texts in their new context, and allows for a certain flexibility in how the author might incorporate these allusions.

Like the scholars above, I acknowledge that no set of criteria is exhaustive or entirely applicable to every situation, and that, in the end, the judgment of scholars is subjective. The first five criteria are those that can be found within the narrative. The remaining criteria are those that can be located outside of the text. The likelihood of an allusion in any given text is increased when elements of both types of criteria are present in the passage.

1. *Shared Circumstances*: This may involve the placement of characters in a similar setting, whether geographical (wilderness, sea, mountaintop), relational (prophetic succession, father/son language) or in a certain event (betrothal, persecution).¹²² Affinities may also be found in the shared abilities or personalities between two characters (miracle-working, asceticism).
2. *Shared Vocabulary*: This refers to the presence of distinctive vocabulary, but might also include vocabulary that belongs to the same semantic domain. Increased density of similar vocabulary within a passage increases likelihood that it contains an allusion to a shared event or circumstance.
3. *Recurrence*: If a scriptural text has already been cited or alluded to within the narrative, more weight should be given to other claims of less explicit or obvious allusions to that text within the work, since it has already been shown that the author was aware of and made use of that passage, story, or book elsewhere in the narrative.
4. *Interruption*: An interruption of the flow of the narrative, whether by the presence of introductory formulae, the disturbance of the syntax, or the introduction of new words, concepts, or stylistic features, might indicate the author's use of other traditions such as the scriptures.
5. *Illumination*: This criterion is the most subjective of all, since it seeks to measure the efficacy of the allusion upon the narrative as well as the

¹²² See Alter, *Art*, 47-62, for Alter's terminology of "type-scene," which can also be adopted here when referring to shared events between biblical characters.

reader. Does the supposed allusion enhance the presentation and meaning of the passage? Does it even make sense in this context? If so, how does it function in the narrative?

6. *Availability*: The presence of an allusion in a text depends upon whether or not the source of the possible allusion was available to the author and his readers in some fashion, whether in oral or written form.
7. *Historical Likelihood*: Similar to the criterion of availability, this test seeks to determine the likelihood that the author intended his readers to recognize the allusion and its effects on the narrative,¹²³ and that at least some of his readers would have had sufficient competencies to understand the impact of the allusion on its new context.
8. *Historical Parallels*: Do other texts exhibit an awareness of this intertext? Is there evidence of the utilization of the corpus to which the intertext belongs (for example, Righteous Sufferer texts) in other first-century texts?

¹²³ Although it is possible that the author could have included an allusion which he did not expect the readers to recognize or understand, it is more likely that the author intended his audience to benefit from his connections between the scriptures and his own writing.

Chapter 3

Suffering, Death, and *Vindication*: The Importance of Resurrection in Mark's Gospel

Moving toward our goal of an interpretation of Mark 15:34 in light of the Markan narrative, this chapter will focus on whether there are any indications prior to Jesus' words from the cross that Jesus will experience anything but suffering and death. Has Mark prepared his implied readers to anticipate something beyond the passion? Does his narrative elicit an expectation of Jesus' vindication through resurrection? If these questions can be answered in the affirmative, then it can be argued that an allusion to the whole of Ps 22 in Mark 15:34 would likely have not gone unrecognized by his implied readers because they would have been prepared previously by the narrative to anticipate and recognize the shared reference (implicit in the citation, explicit in the narrative) to his vindication contained within the plot of the psalm. In other words, the presence of some foreshadowing of Jesus' suffering, death, *and* resurrection/vindication in the Markan narrative would have guided his readers to be attuned to and recognize the same plot present in Ps 22, the scripture which serves as an important resource for the Markan presentation of Jesus' passion and his identity as a righteous sufferer.

The first section of the chapter will be concerned with the formal passion-resurrection predictions (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34) in Mark's narrative. I use the term "formal" to distinguish the three passion-resurrection predictions of similar structure found in these passages from other predictions and the general foreshadowing of Jesus' passion and resurrection found elsewhere in the narrative. First to be addressed will be the function of the three formal predictions in the narrative, with specific emphasis on how one's interpretation, and even labeling, of these predictions can affect one's view of the general tenor and emphases of the gospel. This will be followed by a close reading of each of the formal passion-resurrection predictions and an examination of how each fits in the Markan narrative and prepares the reader for what lies ahead. In the second section of the chapter attention will be turned to the other passages which foreshadow both Jesus' death and resurrection/vindication (Mark 9:9-13; 12:10, 11; 14:25; 14:27, 28) and their function in the narrative will be discussed. Jesus' prediction of his future exaltation in the presence of the high priest (Mark 14:62) and two of the events immediately

following Jesus' death—the tearing of the temple veil (Mark 15:38) and the announcement of the centurion (Mark 15:39)—will be examined in the third section as further indications that Jesus will be vindicated, elements which appear even in the midst of the passion account.

A. The Formal Passion-Resurrection Predictions

The Markan “Passion Predictions”: A Misnomer?

The Markan Jesus' three predictions of his passion and resurrection at the center of the gospel narrative (8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34) are commonly referred to as the “passion predictions.”¹²⁴ Those who use this terminology, whether consciously or not, focus on only one aspect of the prediction: the future suffering and death of Jesus. Yet all three of these passages include the prediction of his resurrection as well!¹²⁵ This imbalanced emphasis commonly held among NT scholars is demonstrated by the phrases used by William Lane to describe these three passages: “Jesus' prophecy of his rejection and suffering,” “the three cardinal announcements of forthcoming humiliation,” “Jesus' solemn declaration,” and “solemn pronouncement.”¹²⁶ While the “passion” portion of the prediction is indeed important and emphasized throughout the Markan narrative and especially in the forthcoming passion narrative, it is clear from his inclusion of the resurrection prediction that the latter is also a key component in his narrative. Thus, to refer to these formal predictions as “passion predictions” *alone* does not do justice to their function in Mark's narrative or in the Markan Jesus' understanding of the events that await him.

Furthermore, an interpretation of these passages which ignores the critical prediction of the resurrection can have a profound affect on how one perceives the tenor of the entire gospel narrative and Mark's resurrection account in particular. An undue emphasis on Jesus' suffering and death at the cost of muting his resurrection (or relegating the latter to merely an afterthought on the part of the author) fails to

¹²⁴ For example, Ray McKinnis, “Analysis of Mark 10:32-34,” *NovT* 18 (1976): 81-100; Hooker, *Mark*, 204; Mark Proctor, “After Three Days' in Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34: Subordinating Jesus' Resurrection in the Second Gospel,” *PRSt* 30 (2003): 399-424.

¹²⁵ This is also underscored by Craig A. Evans, “Did Jesus Predict His Death and Resurrection?” in *Resurrection* (ed. S. Porter, M. Hayes, D. Tombs; JSNTSup 186; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 85 (82-97).

¹²⁶ Lane, *Gospel*, 292-93, 296.

give attention to an event for which Mark has been preparing his readers throughout the narrative.¹²⁷ It has been popular in recent scholarship to perceive of Mark's gospel as a type of *film noir* which concentrates on the bleakness of Jesus' suffering and death and has little interest in his resurrection/vindication. Often influencing this type of reading is the somewhat perplexing abrupt ending to the gospel which concludes with the frightened women fleeing the tomb,¹²⁸ and/or the interpretation of Jesus' cry from the cross (Mark 15:34) as one of utter despair with no hope of vindication.¹²⁹ However, the content of the predictions in Mark 8:31; 9:31; and 10:34 remind us that, although it is clear that Jesus' passion is important to the Markan narrative, it should not be overemphasized to the point that one misses the impact of the resurrection as well. This is especially helpful since, as predictions of the events yet to come, these passages serve as narrative clues directed toward the implied reader for understanding the passion narrative and resurrection account.

Having said this, I acknowledge that Mark includes more detail in his descriptions of Jesus' passion in 8:31, 9:31, and 10:33-34 than in his prediction of his resurrection. I do not believe that to swing the pendulum back completely the other way (emphasizing the resurrection while deemphasizing the passion) solves the problem. I am merely advocating giving due emphasis to each aspect of the prediction by following the lead of the narrative in recognizing that *both* components are *always* present and are thus an indication of the importance of both in understanding the Markan Jesus' person and work—a call for the type of balance which has been seriously lacking in Markan scholarship up to this study.

In addition, the present experience of Mark's implied readers within the Christian community¹³⁰ of Jesus as the risen Christ would indicate that his vindication via resurrection would already be a key assumption that they would have

¹²⁷ Mark 8:31; 9:9, 31; 10:34; 12:10-11; 14:28 (possibly 14:25).

¹²⁸ Although the majority of scholars believe the text-critical evidence indicates that Mark 16:1-8 is indeed the original ending, e.g. Kurt Aland, "Bemerkungen zum Schluss des Markusevangeliums," in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (eds. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969), 157-80, some still have doubts: See Gundry, *Apology*, 1012-21; and Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20* (WBC 34B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 540-41, for example. See Larry W. Hurtado, "The Women, the Tomb, and the Climax of Mark," forthcoming, for a defense of Mark 16:1-8 as "an entirely meaningful and highly satisfactory climax to his story of Jesus (1)."

¹²⁹ This type of interpretation will be addressed in detail in Chapter 7.

¹³⁰ See my previous discussion of Mark's implied readers in Chapter 1.

brought to the text. Perhaps this best explains the absence of specific details of the resurrection in the passion-resurrection predictions on the one hand, and the plethora of details concerning Jesus' suffering and death on the other hand. It is likely that the concept of the suffering and death of the Christ would have been more problematic to Mark's readers than his resurrection, and would thus have required more preparation, explanation, and justification in the narrative.¹³¹ However, this does not indicate that the resurrection was unimportant and/or secondary to Mark's interests as presented in his narrative.

A first step to a more balanced interpretation of these predictions, and by extension to the Markan narrative as a whole, is to avoid the misnomer "passion predictions" in favor of a term which underscores both the positive and negative aspects of the prediction. Thus, the (formal) "passion-resurrection predictions" will be the term used consistently throughout this work.

For similar reasons, in this study I will also refer to what scholars most often term Mark's "passion narrative" as Mark's "passion-resurrection narrative" (hereafter "PRN").¹³² This terminology is used in order to emphasize the fact that, in Mark's gospel, Jesus' passion and resurrection are often presented in continuity. They are intimately connected throughout Mark (e. g. the passion-resurrection predictions) and especially in Mark 16:6.¹³³

¹³¹ We can imagine that the readers' preoccupation with Jesus' statements of death (rather than resurrection) would have mirrored this same sort of reaction of the disciples, represented by Peter in Mark 8:32. Peter's attention latches onto the first part of Jesus' prediction, rather than the second, since this is the more problematic of the two and presumably does not fit into his scheme of what should be expected of the Christ (Mark 8:29), while resurrection was a familiar eschatological expectation for God's people.

¹³² When emphasizing Jesus' suffering and crucifixion alone, I will use the common language of "passion narrative" (PN).

¹³³ The relationship between the rest of Mark and his PRN is likely more complex than that he just inserted an entire received PRN ("pre-Markan PN") or completely composed his own independently of any tradition. Scholarly opinions on this topic run the gamut from those espoused by form criticism (that the PN was entirely received and is distinguishable from Mark 1-13) to narrative criticism (the narrative, including the PN, should be regarded and interpreted as a whole).

It should also be noted that, although it is still the scholarly consensus that there was a pre-Markan passion narrative (following the argument of form-critics such as Rudolph Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* [2nd ed; tr. J. Marsh; Oxford: Blackwell, 1968], 275-84; and Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* [tr. B. Woolf; London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934], 178-83), there are those who dispute this. Cf. Burton Mack, *Myth of Innocence* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1998); John L. White, "The Way of the Cross: Was There a Pre-Markan Passion Narrative?" *Forum* 3:2 (1987): 35-49; John R. Donahue, "From Passion Traditions to Passion Narrative," in *The Passion in Mark* (ed. W. Kelber; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 1-20; Werner Kelber, *The Oral and*

Mark 8:31

Καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκταίνεσθαι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι.

And he began to teach them that it was necessary for the Son of Man to suffer many things and to be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes and to be killed and after three days to rise;

The first formal passion-resurrection prediction comes on the heels of a series of Jesus' healings and miracles which has dominated the narrative thus far. It displays a general pattern of structure in its setting (on the way, ὁδός, to another region, 8:27; 9:30; 10:32), purpose (teaching his disciples), and subsequent negative reaction of the disciples (rebuke, ἐπιτιμάω, 8:32; misunderstanding, ἀγνοέω, and fear, φοβέω, 9:32; 10:35-45), a structure which will be followed by the other two formal passion-resurrection predictions.¹³⁴ There are several components of the prediction which have been the focus of commentators, each of which will be discussed briefly below.

The function of δεῖ at the beginning of the prediction is emphatic, highlighting the necessity of the events that are to take place. Although some interpret it as an indication of the inevitability of the future events due to God's will that they should happen,¹³⁵ others see it as a specific reference to scriptural

Written Gospel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983): 184-220. In addition, those of the consensus often do not agree on which parts of the passion narrative are pre-Markan and which are Markan additions/redactions! For example, Eta Linnemann, *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 171-77, argues that, although there were some traditional components incorporated into Mark's passion narrative, there existed no *coherent* pre-Markan passion narrative. White, "Way," 42, believes this view of a pre-Markan passion narrative can be credited to an overall view of the gospel writers as *collectors*, rather than authors. This view is aptly demonstrated by Dibelius, *Tradition*, 3: "The literary understanding of the synoptics begins with the recognition that they are collections of material. The composers are only to the smallest extent authors. They are primarily collectors, vehicles of tradition, editors."

¹³⁴ This passage has been thought by some to form the basis from which the other predictions are derived. E. g. Georg Strecker, "The Passion and Resurrection Predictions in Mark's Gospel," *Int* 22 (1968): 433-435 (421-42). Consistent with our focus on the narrative unity of Mark's gospel, issues such as the authenticity of the sayings (whether Jesus actually spoke these predictions or whether they are Markan literary creations) and whether they contain pre-Markan material will not be addressed.

¹³⁵ Hooker, *Mark*, 206; Hans F. Bayer, *Jesus' Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection: The Provenance, Meaning, and Correlation of the Synoptic Predictions* (WUNT 2/20; Tübingen: J. C.

necessity.¹³⁶ It appears that both nuances may be in view here, as Jesus clearly sees his mission as doing the will of God (14:36), a mission which, in its presentation in the narrative, is repeatedly bolstered by Mark's appeal to the scriptures.¹³⁷ Does δεῖ refer to the entire prediction and thus to the necessity of the resurrection as well as the passion? This is most likely the case due to, (a) the consistent inclusion of the resurrection element in the passion-resurrection predictions; (b) the possible allusion to Hos 6:2 in the phrase "after three days" (see below); and (c) the cadence of the aorist infinitives throughout both portions of the prediction, of which the prediction of the resurrection is a part (ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι, ἀποκτανθῆναι, and ἀναστῆναι).

Perhaps the issue that most preoccupies scholars when dealing with this passage concerns the meaning of the phrase "the Son of Man" (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). More specifically, the discussion is centered on whether or not the phrase alludes to the scriptures, and if so, to what scripture does it allude? Most scholars agree that the primary background of the phrase is Daniel 7, and perhaps secondarily the use of the phrase in Ezekiel,¹³⁸ although some believe it to be merely a circumlocution for "I."¹³⁹ M. Hooker argues that the phrase was used by Jesus not as a title, but as an indication that he placed himself in the role which the term evokes (derived from Dan 7), a role which is one of obedience and faith in the midst of persecution with the hope of future vindication.¹⁴⁰ Hooker joins C. F. D. Moule on this point, who argues that the Son of Man figure is representative of those "holy

B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1986), 204, argues that it connotes eschatological necessity by expressing the events' role in God's "plan of salvation." So also W. J. Bennett, Jr. "The Son of Man Must. . ." *NovT* 17 (1975): 113-29.

¹³⁶ See H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. D. Barton; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 188-93; Gundry, *Apology*, 446, argues this based on, (a) the probable allusion to Ps 118:22-23 in Mark's use of ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι in the prediction; (b) the appeals to scripture in Mark 9:12 and 14:21 (which also predict his suffering and betrayal); and (c) the use of δεῖ in 9:11, a "paraphrastic quotation" of Mal 4:5 (MT).

¹³⁷ So also Lane, *Gospel*, 301.

¹³⁸ See Gundry, *Apology*, 428-29; Hooker, *Mark*, 89-93; Morna Hooker, "Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?" in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 155-68; Jane Schaberg, "Daniel 7, 12 and the New Testament Passion-Resurrection Predictions," *NTS* 31 (1985): 208-22, for a sampling of those works which address specifically the role of the phrase in the Markan passion-resurrection predictions.

¹³⁹ Lane, *Gospel*, 297, follows Geza Vermes, "The Use of *בן נשא* *בר נשא* in Jewish Aramaic," in *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (ed. M. Black; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 310-28.

¹⁴⁰ See Hooker, "Insoluble?," 155-68, for her full argument.

ones” (Dan 7:8) who are “vindicated in the heavenly court after tribulation,” and is thus used by Mark to indicate Jesus’ confidence in his ultimate authority and vindication.¹⁴¹ Nevertheless, D. Juel is correct in his assertion that “the point of the first of the passion predictions (*sic*) would be just as clear if nothing more were known about the title ‘Son of Man’ than that it was an enigmatic self-designation of Jesus.”¹⁴² However the phrase is used elsewhere, in the case of the Markan passion-resurrection predictions it is clear that, (a) Jesus is referring to himself; and (b) there is a strong connection between his self-designation as the Son of Man and the suffering and vindication he will experience in the future.¹⁴³

The presence of a form of ἀποδοκιμάζω here and in Mark 12:10 (ἀπεδοκίμασαν) in the citation of Ps 118:22-23 (LXX Ps 117:22-23) (the only two places where the verb is used in Mark) suggests that this is also an allusion to the psalm.¹⁴⁴ This is additionally supported by the fact that the Markan Jesus uses the psalmic passage to elucidate his parable (directed to the chief priests, scribes, and elders! 11:27) of the rejection of the beloved son (12:6), which is culminated by the assertion that God will vindicate the rejected one. All three forms of discourse presently under discussion share this “plot” of rejection, death, and vindication: prediction (8:31), parable (12:1-9), and scriptural quotation (12:10-11).¹⁴⁵

The discrepancy between the Markan “after three days” (μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας) and Matthew and Luke’s “on the third day” (τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ; Matt 16:21; 17:23; 20:19; Luke 9:22; 18:33) in the predictions of Jesus’ resurrection has attracted the attention of many scholars. While there are those who deny that there is any

¹⁴¹ C. F. D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 14.

¹⁴² Donald H. Juel, *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* (SBLDS 31; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977), 90.

¹⁴³ Of the fourteen times the phrase is used in Mark, seven of them are in connection with both suffering and vindication (8:31; 8:38; 9:9, 12; 9:31; 10:33; 14:62). Cf. MacDonald, *Homeric Epics*, 16-17, for his intriguing proposal that the πολλὰ παθεῖν of Mark 8:31 is an uncommon phrase also found with reference to Odysseus in *The Odyssey* 5.223; 7.224; 8.155; 10.465; and 15.401, and thus may be a Markan patterning after Homer’s presentation of the Greek hero. Although the Homeric literature was indeed “in the air” during the first century C.E., it is much more likely that Mark’s presentation of his own hero would have been more influenced by the heroes of the scriptures of Israel, as evidenced by his extensive use of these scriptures.

¹⁴⁴ This verb is also relatively uncommon in the rest of the NT, appearing only in Matt 21:42; Luke 9:22; 17:25; 20:17; 1 Pet 2:4, 7; and Heb 12:17.

¹⁴⁵ Gundry, *Apology*, 446, notes that there are other instances in the NT where Jesus’ death is described with language from Ps 118:22-23 (Acts 4:11; 1 Pet 2:4, 7).

qualitative difference between the two,¹⁴⁶ many see a problematic distinction and thus take pains to either explain or reconcile the Markan phrase with the timing of the resurrection in his own passion-resurrection narrative,¹⁴⁷ or extract the motivation for the discrepancy from the theological motivations of the narrative itself.¹⁴⁸ With J. B. Bauer, some argue that the phrase can also have a more generic meaning, indicating merely a short period of time.¹⁴⁹

It has also been suggested that the phrase is motivated by an allusion to Hos 6:2, where the people of God will be raised up and made alive “after two days, on the third day” (μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ). C. Evans finds this to be the best explanation for the presence of both prepositions in the Synoptic gospels, since both variations are incorporated here.¹⁵⁰ H. Bayer acknowledges the possibility that the later rabbinic interpretation of Hos 6:2 as a passage which refers to the eschatological resurrection “on the third day after the end of the world” could have been a concept available to Mark and from which he could have drawn, although he notes that it could refer more generally to the teaching that God would not tolerate the righteous to suffer longer than three days.¹⁵¹ Against the reading of this passage as an allusion to Hos 6:2, Gundry underscores the different wording/numbering of the days: Mark’s “after three days” as opposed to Hosea’s “after two days, on the third day.” This

¹⁴⁶ Hooker, *Mark*, 206, believes that there is no real difference between the two phrases, but that Matthew and Luke made theirs more precise so as not to be confused with the alternate meaning of “a short time later.” Bayer, *Predictions*, 206, argues that μετὰ can mean “on” when it refers to “a present activity (which) comes to a conclusion without mentioning further activities,” and cites Gal 1:18 as another instance of this use.

¹⁴⁷ Gundry, *Apology*, 447, believes the timing can be explained by using the Jewish method of counting part of a twenty-four hour day as a whole: “This method results in counting part of Friday, all of Saturday, and part of Sunday as three days, after which Jesus rises up.” He cites Gen 42:17-18; 1 Sam 30:1, 12-13; 2 Chr 10:5; and Esth 4:16-5:1 as evidence of this method of counting. Strecker, “Passion,” 429, believes the contradiction to be an indication of the Markan redactor’s use of an underlying source.

¹⁴⁸ Proctor, “After,” 399-424, argues that Mark’s alteration of the timing of Jesus’ resurrection (compared to Paul’s, the other gospels, and his own PN), combined with the increasing detail of his suffering and death, suggest that he is subordinating the resurrection in favour of an emphasis on Jesus’ death.

¹⁴⁹ Johannes B. Bauer, “Drei Tage,” *Bib* 39 (1958): 354-58; Lane, *Gospel*, 303. John M. Perry, “The Three Days in the Synoptic Passion Predictions,” *CBQ* 48 (1986): 637-54, explains the discrepancy by attributing the Markan phrase to the “Aramaic-speaking church’s” understanding of Jesus’ predictions and the sequence of events, and the other to the “Greek-speaking church,” but his evidence is lacking and his argument speculative.

¹⁵⁰ Evans, “Predict?” 94-95.

¹⁵¹ Bayer, *Predictions*, 207.

argument appears, however, to contradict his previous assertion concerning the Jewish method of counting, in which it is conceivable that both phrases could end up referring to the same day, albeit using different wording.¹⁵²

Given the similarity of wording in Hos 6:2 and the Markan “after three days,” it seems possible that the implied readers would have recalled the former when hearing the latter. This is strengthened even more by the similar context of each passage, which deals with the vindication of God’s chosen after a short time. It should also be pointed out that in his PRN Mark does not bother to narrate *when* the resurrection occurs, only when the tomb is *discovered* empty.¹⁵³ Thus, the discrepancy between the Markan passion-resurrection predictions and those of Matthew and Luke and Mark’s own PRN should not surprise us, since Mark is not concerned with being precise about the timing of the actual resurrection. This may substantiate the argument that, for Mark at least, the function of “after three days” is to underscore the short amount of time between Jesus’ death and resurrection, a fact which is indicated by the emphatic forward position of the phrase (before the verb).¹⁵⁴

Brief mention must be made of the verb used to refer to Jesus’ resurrection, ἀνίστημι, in the passion-resurrection predictions. In all but one instance, Mark uses ἀνίστημι, rather than ἐγείρω, when relaying predictions about the Son of Man’s passion and resurrection (8:31; 9:9, 10, 31; 10:34; exception in 14:28).¹⁵⁵ Is there a difference in meaning (in the Markan narrative) between the two words? This does not appear to be the case, as both are used to refer to the act of rising from the dead.¹⁵⁶ It is more likely that the difference depends upon the subject of the raising, where Mark usually prefers ἐγείρω when referring to a general resurrection and often

¹⁵² Gundry, *Apology*, 446. See footnote 24. If the different wording were not a hindrance in finding an equivalent meaning in Mark and Matthew/Luke, why would it be hindrance in Hosea and Mark, especially if Mark’s readers would have been familiar with this method of counting?

¹⁵³ Along with Gundry, *Apology*, 430.

¹⁵⁴ Norman Perrin, *The Resurrection Narratives: A New Approach* (London: SCM Press, 1977), 27, sees the “after six days” (μετὰ ἡμέρας ἕξ) at the beginning of the transfiguration account (9:2) as a deliberate parallel to μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας in the Markan passion-resurrection predictions, which is consistent with his view that the transfiguration account is the equivalent of a Markan resurrection appearance.

¹⁵⁵ Unlike Matthew and Luke who use the latter, with the exception of Luke 18:33.

¹⁵⁶ Along with Bayer, *Predictions*, 209.

reserves ἀνίστημι when specifically addressing Jesus' resurrection.¹⁵⁷ Noting previously the probable influence of Hos 6:2 on the "after three days" phrase, it is possible that the scripture also reinforced Mark's choice of ἀνίστημι, since it contains the same verb (ἀναστησόμεθα).

Mark 9:31

ἐδίδασκεν γὰρ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀποκτανθεὶς μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται.

For he was teaching his disciples and saying to them, "The Son of Man will be betrayed into (the) hands of men, and they will kill him, and when he is killed after three days he will rise."

The second formal passion-resurrection prediction comes after the account of Jesus' exorcism of an unclean spirit from a boy (9:14-29) after the disciples' failed attempt to do so. The intriguing narration of the crowd's belief that the boy is dead (9:26) and the boy's subsequent "resurrection" (ἤγειρεν, ἀνέστη, 9:27) by the offering of Jesus' hand foreshadows the language of the following passion-resurrection prediction. The prior narrative of the transfiguration and Jesus' comments on the future suffering and resurrection of the Son of Man (9:2-13) also provide a context from which to understand Mark 9:31.

The setting of the second formal passion-resurrection prediction takes place on the road through Galilee to Capernaum (9:33), and is (at least a portion of) some teaching addressed to his disciples. Of the three formal passion-resurrection predictions, it contains the least amount of detail of the events that will take place, and is ambiguous about the identity of Jesus' persecutors (παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας

¹⁵⁷ There are exceptions to this: Mark 12:25 and 14:28, for example. Some have argued that the different vocabulary is evidence that the passion-resurrection predictions are derived from a separate tradition, for example, Evans, "Predict?," 94; Bayer, *Predictions*, 165, argues that Mark 8:31-33 together should be taken as a pre-Markan unit, rather than the prediction proper. It is also possible that ἀνίστημι focuses on Jesus' own power and role in resurrection, while ἐγείρω indicates the occupation of a more passive role in the one being raised (by God).

ἀνθρώπων). It offers no new details about either the suffering/death or the resurrection of the Son of Man.

Most of the discussion of this prediction centers on the identification of the agent of παραδίδοται.¹⁵⁸ Hooker notes that the verb παραδίδωμι can have the more specific meaning of “betrayed” (Mark 3:19 and 14:18-21), or the more general sense of “handed over” (she gives the example of Rom 8:32). She argues that the second of these meanings is more appropriate in Mark 9:31 for two reasons: (1) the unlikelihood that Mark is referring to Judas’ betrayal since this would be the only detail of the PRN he has included here; and (2) it would then be expected that there would be a reference to the chief priests and scribes (as in 10.33) rather than to the generic term “men.” From this she concludes that the more likely meaning is that it is God himself who will deliver the Son of Man into the hands of men,¹⁵⁹ an argument that she elsewhere supports by seeing a deliberate contrast between the divine passive and ἀνθρώπων.¹⁶⁰ However, the fact that she has to draw this meaning of παραδίδωμι from outside of the typical Markan use of the term weakens her argument considerably. Furthermore, it is equally possible that the generic term “men” is merely ambiguous, rather than serving as an implicit contrast to a divine agent.

Against Hooker’s reading, Gundry argues that παραδίδωμι does not convey the notion that it is God who will hand Jesus over to his persecutors, but rather that there will be betrayal from within his own disciples. This is supported by the fact that παραδίδοται replaces ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι from Mark 8:31.¹⁶¹ He also calls attention to the meaning of “into the hands of men” in the scriptures, extra-canonical literature,

¹⁵⁸ παραδίδοται is simply a futuristic present, as evidenced by the following future verbs (ἀποκτενοῦσιν and ἀναστήσεται), and the nature of a prediction as explicating a future event. *Contra* Lane, *Gospel*, 336, who argues that the present tense indicates “a fact so certain it can be described as accomplished (‘is delivered’).”

¹⁵⁹ Hooker, *Mark*, 226. Others argue for this interpretation based on their reading of an underlying reference to Isa 53:6,12, in which God gives his servant over to suffering and death. But Gundry, *Mark*, 506, rightly underscores the fact that there is no notion of the Isa 53-type vicarious death here in the prediction, and that there is no version of Isa 53 which includes the phrase “into hands of . . .”

¹⁶⁰ Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark* (London: SPCK, 1967), 135.

¹⁶¹ Gundry, *Apology*, 503.

and the NT as “oppressive and violent treatment.”¹⁶² Moreover, Mark uses παραδίδωμι to describe what Judas Iscariot will do (in his editorial statements and in Jesus’ sayings) in giving Jesus over to the Jewish authorities (10:33b; 14:10, 11, 18, 21, 41, 42, 44), a fact which guards against a divine passive in Mark 9:31. In addition, Mark 10:33 contains the same verb to describe the chief priests and scribes handing Jesus over to the Gentiles, Mark 15:1 the Jewish authorities handing Jesus over to Pilate, and Mark 15:15 Pilate’s handing Jesus over to the soldiers who will crucify him.¹⁶³

Furthermore, the idea that God will be antagonistic toward Jesus by handing him over to his persecutors goes against the predominant Markan presentation of both God and Jesus as those who are on the same side with the same agenda.¹⁶⁴ Given the violent and oppressive connotations bound up in the word (see above), as well as Mark’s use of the word in a similar manner with reference to the betrayal of Judas (14:18-21), there appears to be no precedent for a *Markan* use of the term that implies divine agency. Even if one interprets Jesus’ cry from the cross in Mark 15:34 as a cry of abandonment which protests the absence of God, the difference between the actions of “abandoning” and “handing over” must be acknowledged. Thus, even this rendering of the passive παραδίδοται probably does not shed light on or foreshadow the relationship between God and Jesus conveyed in Mark 15:34.

Another (similar) option is to interpret the passive παραδίδοται as indicating Judas’ act of betrayal as *God’s agent* (an indirect divine passive). Gundry notes that the reference to scripture in Mark 14:21 might indicate this type of agency, but argues that other factors such as, (a) the use of the active voice in Mark 14:18 when predicting Judas’ coming betrayal “One of you will give me over;” (b) the use of παραδίδωμι to refer to the actions of the Jewish authorities and Pilate (who are clearly not portrayed as God’s agents in Mark); (c) the presence of the passive in Mark 10:33 followed immediately by an active verb referring to human action; and

¹⁶² Gundry, *Apology*, 503, lists as examples: Mark 14:41, 46; Lev 26:25; Deut 1:27; 2 Sam 24:14; 2 Kgs 21:14; Job 9:22-24; 16:11; Ps 106:41; Jer 26:24 MT and LXX; Dan 7:25; 11:11; Zech 11:6; 1 Macc 4:30; Jdt 6:10; Sir 2:18; Acts 21:11; 28:17.

¹⁶³ Gundry, *Apology*, 506.

¹⁶⁴ Along with Gundry, *Apology*, 507.

(d) the narrative account of Judas' betrayal in Mark 14:41, 42, guard against reading this as an act by one of God's agents.¹⁶⁵

Given the evidence above, it appears that the best interpretive option with regard to παραδίδοται is to see it as an implicit reference to Judas' betrayal of Jesus to the Jewish and Gentile authorities. This is consistent with the other uses of the word in the Markan narrative, as well Mark's presentation of Jesus and his relation to God in both his person and work.

Mark 10:33-34

ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς γραμματεῦσιν, καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν
αὐτὸν θανάτῳ καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ³⁴ καὶ ἐμπαίζουσιν
αὐτῷ καὶ ἐμπτύσουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν,
καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται.

“Look, we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man will be betrayed to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death and they will hand him over to the Gentiles and they will mock him and spit upon him and flog him and kill (him), and after three days he will rise.”

Clearly the most detailed and extensive of the three formal passion-resurrection predictions in Mark, 10:33-34 is perhaps the most intriguing of the three because of its inner narrative-like structure, which corresponds closely with the plot of the PRN itself. Even the setting of the third prediction (10:32), on the road (ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ) to Jerusalem, anticipates in an explicit manner the events which will soon be recounted in the PRN. This is underscored by the repetition of the Markan Jesus' stated goal present within his own passion-resurrection prediction. Hooker states well the importance of the setting for the remainder of the narrative:

These verses mark another important stage in the story; the course of Jesus' journey through Judaea is no longer vague but takes on a definite aim: Jesus is openly heading for Jerusalem. In one sense this can be described as the

¹⁶⁵ Gundry, *Apology*, 507.

beginning of the passion narrative (*sic*), for at this point the events which lead inevitably to his death are put in motion.¹⁶⁶

This passion-resurrection prediction is also shrouded with an aura of mystery, as Jesus' action (going to Jerusalem) elicits both amazement (ἐθαμβοῦντο) and fear (ἐφοβοῦντο) from those around him. The reference to Jesus' taking the twelve "again" (πάλιν) in Mark 10:32 likely refers to the two previous formal passion-resurrection predictions, which Jesus also directed specifically to his disciples.¹⁶⁷ Although much focus has been spent on whether this prediction was shaped *after* the PRN or *vice versa*, this will not be a preoccupation of this study where our interest lies in how the passion-resurrection prediction *as we have it* functions to prepare the implied reader for the events that will take place in the PRN.¹⁶⁸

This prediction is significant for its inclusion of several details not given in the other formal predictions. These include Jesus' condemnation to death by the Jewish authorities (κατακρινουσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ) and their handing him over to the Gentiles (παρὰδῶσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν), as well as specifics of the sufferings that he will endure: being mocked (ἐμπαίζουσιν αὐτῷ), spat upon (ἐμπτύουσιν αὐτῷ), and flogged (μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτὸν). Like the other two, this prediction ends with the statement that he will be killed and will rise after three days. The order of the events in the prediction follows the order recounted in the PRN relatively closely, save for the flogging (a different verb is used in Mark 15:15: φραγελλόω), although it should not be assumed that Mark intended his description of the events to be understood in a strictly linear fashion. Nevertheless, the elaborate nature of the third formal passion-resurrection prediction underscores the fact that the drama of the passion-resurrection predictions has increased, with Mark 10:33-34 functioning as the climax of the three, just as the narrative is heading toward its own climax in the account of Jesus' passion and resurrection. Thus, the three formal passion-resurrection predictions are, as Strecker observes, "progressively assimilated to the passion narrative."¹⁶⁹ In addition, like the presentation of his other minor predictions throughout the PRN (for example, Mark 11:2-6; 14:12-16; 14:18; 14:27, 50; 14:30,

¹⁶⁶ Hooker, *Mark*, 244.

¹⁶⁷ Pace Bayer, *Predictions*, 172; McKinnis, "Analysis," 87.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. McKinnis, "Analysis," 98-100; Strecker, "Passion," 434; Bayer, *Predictions*, 173, 181; Lane, *Gospel*, 375; for a discussion on the origin of this passion-resurrection prediction.

¹⁶⁹ Strecker, "Passion," 435.

66-72), the Markan Jesus is presented as one whose predictions come true by Mark's inclusion of the many details of the passion which come to fulfilment in the PRN. Thus, Jesus is presented as a true prophet. This indicates to Mark's implied readers that Jesus' words are trustworthy, and therefore that, since the details of his suffering come true in the PRN, so also will they be able to trust the veracity of his resurrection prediction.

It is clear in comparing the content of the three formal passion-resurrections predictions and the PRN (see chart below) that Mark takes great care to show that every detail of Jesus' passion is accurately predicted by him.¹⁷⁰ As I have suggested earlier, Mark's inclusion of the *details* of the passion (and not of the resurrection) in these predictions probably indicates that it is Jesus' violent death which was causing the most problems for his implied readers. Mark anticipates this difficulty and strives to show that Jesus' suffering and death were indeed an integral and necessary (δεῖ) part of the divine plan. Subsequently, Mark's repeatedly stark and straightforward reference to Jesus' resurrection may indicate that this aspect of the gospel was the more easily and readily accepted of the two.¹⁷¹ It must be reiterated that this does not indicate a lack of interest on Mark's part in the resurrection, or a lack of importance in his overall narrative. The presence of Jesus' resurrection in every formal passion-resurrection prediction strongly suggests otherwise.

In concluding our discussion of the three formal passion-resurrection predictions and their function in repeatedly emphasizing the future suffering, death, and resurrection of Jesus and preparing the reader for both his suffering and vindication, the following chart has been provided in order to see in one place both the shared and unique elements of the other formal passion-resurrection predictions and the PRN.¹⁷² The many shared elements between the passion-resurrection

¹⁷⁰ Vernon K. Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 20, also notes that Mark is fond of using repetitive forms of three units to present Jesus' identity and its implications for discipleship.

¹⁷¹ I thank Professor L.W. Hurtado for also pointing out that, in Mark, while the passion of Jesus is a result of *human* actions, the resurrection is *God's* miraculous act, and his very nature is sufficient to compensate fully for these negative human actions (i.e., his actions need no explanation/justification); private conversation, 05/09/05.

¹⁷² This chart is an adaptation of the one provided in Lane, *Gospel*, 375.

predictions and the PRN suggests that the former function to emphasize certain later elements found in the PRN.¹⁷³

		8:31	9:31	10:33-34	PRN
1.	Handed over to the chief priests and scribes	_____	(✓) ¹⁷⁴	✓	14:53
2.	Sentenced to death	(✓) ¹⁷⁵	_____	✓	14:64
3.	Handed over to the Romans	_____	(✓) ¹⁷⁶	✓	15:1, 10
4.	Mocked, spat upon, flogged	_____	_____	✓	(14:65); 15:15-20
5.	Executed	✓	✓	✓	15:20-39, 44
6.	Resurrected	✓	✓	✓	16:1-8

B. Other Foreshadowing of Jesus' Suffering, Death, and Resurrection

This section of the chapter will focus on how the second half of Mark's narrative has in view both the passion *and* vindication/resurrection of Jesus. Passages which contain this emphasis will be examined in order to highlight their function as

¹⁷³ Juel, *Messiah*, 52.

¹⁷⁴ Literally εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων.

¹⁷⁵ The "rejection" of Jesus (the Son of man) implies the sentencing to death and its carrying out in Mark, as evidenced by his link between the "beloved son" of Mark 12:6-8 and the "stone" in 12:10-11.

¹⁷⁶ εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων may refer to the Jewish authorities and/or the Gentiles.

additional preparation for the implied readers' expectation of Jesus' suffering *and* vindication within the narrative.

Although some see the narrative of the Transfiguration (Mark 9:2-8) as the actual account of Jesus' resurrection appearances superimposed back into the narrative of Jesus' ministry,¹⁷⁷ one of the functions of its final place in the narrative is to provide the context in which Jesus makes another statement concerning his resurrection and passion in **Mark 9:9-13**. The reference to the resurrection of the Son of Man is not in the form of a prediction, but as a statement of fact.¹⁷⁸ Jesus tells Peter, James, and John not to tell anyone about what they had just seen until the Son of Man rises from the dead (εἰ μὴ ὅταν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ). The previous events of the transfiguration account—the transfiguration itself, Jesus' garments becoming blindingly white, his conversation with two of the most revered figures in the scriptures, and the numinous event of the voice of divine affirmation from the cloud—appear to function in the narrative as a foreshadowing of Jesus' resurrection/vindication. This is further substantiated by the awe, fear, and lack of understanding on the part of the three disciples—common Markan reactions which are repeated every time Jesus predicts his resurrection and again in the Markan resurrection account. The foreshadowing element of resurrection in the transfiguration account may also explain why the usual order of the predictive elements has been inverted, with the resurrection mentioned before the suffering of the Son of Man. In this case, the theme of resurrection dominates the passage, unlike the formal passion-resurrection predictions, which include more details of Jesus' suffering and death than of his resurrection.

¹⁷⁷ For example, Francis Watson, "The Social Function of Mark's Secrecy Theme," *JSNT* 24 (1985): 55 (49-69); Perrin, *Resurrection*, 27-32.

¹⁷⁸ Fowler, *Let the Reader*, 86, points out the profound effect this statement would have had on its implied readers/hearers: "I take 9:9 as a specimen of rhetoric, not as a specimen of dogmatized history; that is, I take it not as a statement of Jesus to his disciples in the past about their future but as a statement by the narrator to the reader in the present moment of reading. After all, what is Mark's story of the Transfiguration (9:2-8) but the very 'telling of what they saw' that Mark has Jesus postpone at the story level until after the resurrection of the Son of man? The narrative that has been postponed at the story level has at the discourse level just been told! Even though at 9:9 we have not yet read a narrative from Mark about Jesus' resurrection, nevertheless we have read 9:2-8, which 9:9 tells us is to be narrated only after the resurrection. Therefore, readers must realize, consciously or unconsciously, that they are reading at a time after the resurrection. From this point on the reader's mind is forced to work using the datum provided by the narrator that, as of the present moment of reading, the Son of man has been raised from the dead."

The disciples do not understand what he means by the statement concerning his resurrection, and ask him why the scribes say that it is necessary for Elijah to come first, a question which is probably sparked by the scene they just witnessed (Mark 9:4). It is in this context that Jesus again predicts his suffering (γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενηθῇ; Mark 9:12), which is presented as suffering in solidarity with (an) Elijah that has already come, i.e. John the Baptist (Mark 1:6; 6:17-29; John's previous suffering is implied in the statement ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον; Mark 9:13).

The actions against both Jesus and Elijah are presented as taking place “as it is written” (γέγραπται).¹⁷⁹ It is possible that ἐξουδενηθῇ (ἐξουδενέω) may refer to Ps 118:22 and Isa 53:3,¹⁸⁰ and if so, γέγραπται would refer to a wider background in the scriptures rather than alluding to one specific passage. There also appears to be a link in function between the δεῖ of Mark 8:31 and the γέγραπται of this passage. Both emphasize the necessity of the suffering of the Son of Man and contain an assertion that he will rise afterwards. It is interesting to note that there is both an implicit *parallel* drawn between the respective fates of John the Baptist (Elijah) and Jesus in their mutual experience of persecution and death at the hands of their enemies and an implicit *contrast* in the outcome of Jesus' death in the form of his resurrection, which is highlighted by Mark's emphasis on the resurrection in giving it priority of place in this passage (9:9). Whereas John is only *thought* to have risen from the dead by Herod and others when they mistake Jesus for his predecessor (Mark 6:14-16), Jesus will truly rise from the dead. It is likely that Mark's implied readers would have seen in 6:14-16 an ironic reference to Jesus' resurrection in Herod's comments and the direct contrast of outcomes would have been apparent.

Another reference to Jesus' death and resurrection/vindication takes place in the parable of the tenants and the summarizing citation from Ps 118:22-23 in **Mark 12:1-11**, which occurs after the action-packed portion of the narrative consisting of the temple demonstration (Mark 11:15-19) and the verbal sparring between Jesus and the Jewish leaders (Mark 11:27-33). Due to our examination of the Markan context of this citation from Ps 118:22-23 in the following chapter, it would be superfluous

¹⁷⁹ This is not the only time that the figure of Elijah is mentioned in the context of Jesus' suffering: Mark 15:35-36.

¹⁸⁰ The recensions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion contain this verb.

to repeat that same material here. What is of interest in this section is how the parable and its adjacent psalmic passage reiterate the Markan theme of the suffering and vindication of Jesus in the continuing context of Jesus' confrontations with the Jewish authorities. Here, as in Mark 8:31, the future rejection (both use the verb ἀποδοκιμάζω) of Jesus by these, his persecutors—the chief priests, scribes, and elders mentioned in Mark 11:27—leads to his future vindication by God in giving him primacy of place (κεφαλὴν γωνίας), a vindication which is acknowledged and deemed “marvellous” (θαυμαστός) in the eyes of others (those who constitute the new tenants of the vineyard, Mark 12:9).

It is clear that the parable and its companion citation are primarily concerned with the actions of those who reject the son and their subsequent condemnation by God.¹⁸¹ This is evidenced by its placement in the Markan narrative—in the context of Jesus' disputes with the Jewish authorities—and the conclusion of the scene in 12:12, where he mentions their desire to arrest him because of their realization that the parable and citation were spoken in reference to them. Yet the assertion of the vindication of the son is also important in its role as the climax of the passage, in its function as the conclusion of the “story”: the persecutors will not have the last word—God will—and his word will result in the exaltation of the persecuted one. This exaltation/vindication will take place in connection with the destruction of the old “tenants” and the institution of the new (Mark 12:9). Thus, Bayer correctly asserts that: “The *inseparable material link* between rejection/death and vindication/resurrection is demonstrated in Mk 12:10 where Jesus implies that God vindicates the rejected one as the foundational event of a new order of righteousness.”¹⁸²

What should be emphasized from our examination of this passage is that, although Jesus' resurrection *per se* is not in view, but rather his vindication/exaltation, resurrection is indeed implicit.¹⁸³ This can be argued on the basis of the place of the passage in the overall narrative. Mark's implied readers have

¹⁸¹ Along with Bayer, *Predictions*, 103.

¹⁸² Bayer, *Predictions*, 223. Is the “stone” of Ps 118:22-23 a cornerstone (foundation) or capstone? Bayer, *Predictions*, 108, argues convincingly that a foundation stone is in view because Ps 118:16-21 stress the present vindication of the Righteous Sufferer, rather than the “future consummation of an event.”

¹⁸³ Luke certainly interprets the passage in this way in Acts 4:11, where he has Peter quote this verse directly after his assertion that God has raised Jesus from the dead.

already been informed repeatedly and explicitly that Jesus will experience suffering and death at the hands of his enemies (the almost verbatim repetition of the list of persecutors—οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι—in 11:27 is significant here, as it recalls 8:31), but will rise afterward. A repetition of this “plot” of suffering and death followed by a vindication would have naturally recalled the more explicit details of vindication via resurrection read previously. In addition I would argue that, although in the larger context of Jesus’ disputes with the Jewish authorities his vindication might be construed as having God-ordained authority over them, the immediate context of the parable, in which the son is *killed* by his persecutors, would have suggested to Mark’s implied readers that the citation is referring to Jesus’ vindication from death via resurrection. Thus, although Mark has used Ps 118:22-23 to speak of Jesus, he has adapted it to refer to his own Righteous Sufferer’s future situation which does include both death *and* vindication in resurrection (rather than rescue *from* death, as in Ps 118:17-18).¹⁸⁴ This parable, interpreted alongside of the passion-resurrection prediction of Mark 8:31, forms a type of interpretive apparatus, or blueprint, which Mark provides for his readers’ use in interpreting the events that will take place in the coming PRN. The rejection of the beloved son Jesus will take place in his trial by the Jewish authorities (Mark 14:55-65), and he will be killed as a result of their rejection (Mark 15:24-37); but they will be destroyed and their privileged place given to others (Mark 15:38¹⁸⁵), and he will be vindicated (Mark 14:62; 16:6).¹⁸⁶

At the Passover meal prior to his arrest, Jesus distributes the bread and wine of the meal and reinterprets and infuses it with new meaning—as a commemoration of the impending sacrifice of his own body and blood (Mark 14:22-25). It is in this context, in **Mark 14:25**, that he tells the disciples that he will not drink any more wine until he drinks it anew in the kingdom of God.

The statement that he will not drink anymore implies that he will soon die, a fact which is substantiated by the surrounding context.¹⁸⁷ Conversely, his assertion

¹⁸⁴ See Chapter 4 for my discussion concerning whether the larger context of Ps 118 is in view here.

¹⁸⁵ Note my comments on this passage below.

¹⁸⁶ Helen K. Bond, *Caiaphas: Friend of Rome and Judge of Jesus?* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2004): 104-105.

¹⁸⁷ E.g. the Son of man saying in Mark 14:21, as well as Peter’s interpretation of Jesus’ words in 14:31.

that he will drink again in the kingdom of God anticipates his ability to do so by experiencing resurrection. It is important to note that the emphasis in the statement falls on Jesus' drinking again in the kingdom of God, rather than on the coming of the kingdom. Thus, Mark is underscoring Jesus' future vindication by anticipating his partaking in a celebration of God's new kingdom. This focus on Jesus' personal vindication is further substantiated by the explicit statement that it is *he* who will drink it anew, and not he *and his disciples*.¹⁸⁸ Thus, although the cessation of table fellowship between the disciples and Jesus and its resumption in the future Messianic banquet may also be implied here, it is not the primary Markan emphasis.¹⁸⁹

Immediately following the Passover meal, Jesus again predicts his death and resurrection in **Mark 14:27, 28**. The first part of the prediction is given in the form of a citation from Zech 13:7: "I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered."¹⁹⁰ The second part is in the more typical Markan form of a statement of fact.¹⁹¹ The latter clearly identifies Jesus with the shepherd (see also Mark 6:34), and the "striking" (πατάξω) with his death. It must be noted that this passage constitutes the last explicit reference to Jesus' resurrection before the account of his passion begins.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁸ Gundry, *Apology*, 834.

¹⁸⁹ Bayer, *Predictions*, 50-51, argues that the Markan Jesus is primarily referring to the Messianic banquet, evidenced by the context of the Passover meal in which Ps 118:24 was recited in the Jews' anticipation of the redemption of the Messiah. However, as Gundry has pointed out, the emphasis in Mark 14:25 is not on a communal sharing of the wine, but on Jesus' partaking of the wine after his previous abstinence (by death). Neither is Mark explicit here concerning the eschatological nature of the kingdom of God, which would be expected if the Messianic banquet was implied (Luke 22:18 is more clearly eschatological).

¹⁹⁰ Gundry, *Apology*, 845, notes that the change from the imperative "strike" in the MT and LXX to the first person "I will strike" avoids the implication that those who carry out the striking are merely doing so out of obedience and are thus blameless. Clay A. Ham, *The Coming King and the Rejected Shepherd: Matthew's Reading of Zechariah's Messianic Hope* (New Testament Monographs 4; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005), 70, argues that the change is required due to the absence of the Zech passage which mentions the sword of Yahweh, and may be derived from the final clause in Zech 13:7: "I will turn my hand against the little ones." The change can also be explained by the function of the citation in the passage, (a) as a prediction of what will come; and (b) as a comment directed to his disciples, rather than his enemies.

¹⁹¹ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 129-30, argues that the matter-of-fact nature of Jesus' statement concerning his resurrection is an indication that the phrase is "artificial." Yet this "plain and unadorned" way of referring to his resurrection is found repeatedly in his other predictions (Mark 8:31; 9:9; 9:31; 10:34).

¹⁹² Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel* (Trans. J. Boyce, D. Juel, W. Poehlmann, R. A. Harrisville; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969), 75-92,

The focus of this passage is on the desertion of Jesus by his own disciples, which is evidenced by the use of the citation from Zechariah in the context of Jesus' initial statement that they will all leave him, as well as the following prediction of Peter's specific betrayal of Jesus (Mark 14:29-31). It not only centers on the disciples' desertion, however, but on their future restoration with Jesus after he has been raised. Thus, the two storylines of the passage, i.e., the disciples' desertion of Jesus and their later reunion with him, and Jesus' death and resurrection, are presented in parallel to each other. The near future is bleak in the anticipation of betrayal and death, but it is not entirely so, since it concludes with restoration and resurrection. This second half of the prediction—the outcome of the actions against Jesus—is an extremely important reminder to Mark's implied readers that the events he is about to narrate will include the negative, but will conclude with the positive.

There are several other places where Mark reminds his readers that Jesus will be vindicated after his death on the cross, *even* in the midst of his account of Jesus' suffering. These passages also merit our attention, as they highlight one of the Markan emphases in his portrayal of the death of Jesus. It will be seen that the function of these elements in his passion narrative is to point toward Jesus' vindication by God, a vindication that the readers have been prepared to expect in the form of his resurrection.

The first occurs in **Mark 14:62**, in the context of Jesus' trial before the high priest. During his interrogation, the high priest asks Jesus, "Are you the Christ, the son of the Blessed One?" (14:61). Jesus' answer recalls a similar statement he had made earlier to (some of) his disciples: "I am, and you will see the Son of Man seated at the right of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven,"¹⁹³ both of which are allusions to Dan 7:13: ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν καὶ

holds the minority view that this passage (interpreted in light of Mark 16:7) refers to the Markan Jesus' *parousia* rather than resurrection. Even if this is the case, however, the *parousia* would only be possible if he had risen from the dead. Thus, regardless of one's interpretation here, Jesus' vindication via resurrection is implied by this passage and points the reader to a positive outcome to the death that awaits him.

¹⁹³ Mark 14:62: καὶ ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Mark 13:26: "and then they will see the Son of man coming in (the) clouds with great power and glory." (καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης.)

οἱ παρεστηκότες παρήσαν αὐτῷ.¹⁹⁴ An additional allusion to Ps 110:1, in the Markan Jesus' reference to his future exaltation at the right hand of God (specifically, "the Power"), is likely present in the phrase, especially considering Mark's previous citation of this passage in 12:36. Once again, the phrase "Son of Man" is used in the context of persecution (8:31; 9:12; 9:31; 10:33-34), yet it is precisely in the midst of his narrative of this suffering that Mark highlights the future vindication of Jesus.¹⁹⁵ Thus, Mark directs his readers back to his previous foreshadowing of Jesus' death and resurrection, and points forward to Jesus' future exaltation to the right hand of God himself. Once again Jesus is able to predict what will happen to him, this time at precisely the moment when his previous passion predictions are coming to fulfillment, precisely at the point in the narrative where Jesus appears to be in his most hopeless situation. This "accuracy" in prediction serves as an indication to Mark's readers that this further prediction of his vindication in exaltation will also take place.¹⁹⁶ And in yet another instance of Markan irony, Jesus is portrayed as being mocked for being a prophet at exactly the moment that his prophecies are coming true!¹⁹⁷ Mark also reinforces the accuracy of Jesus' predictive power by relaying Peter's denial in the very next scene, which takes place precisely in the manner which Jesus had predicted (14:66-72; 14:29-31).¹⁹⁸

Another indication of Jesus' vindication occurs in **Mark 15:38**, immediately after Jesus dies, in the report of the rending of the temple veil. The literature concerning the meaning of the tearing of the temple veil is extensive.¹⁹⁹ I am not,

¹⁹⁴ The reference to his exaltation to the right hand of God may also reflect an allusion to LXX Ps 109:1, which has been previously cited in Mark 12:36.

¹⁹⁵ Juel, *Messiah*, 95, argues that the first half of the statement points specifically to his resurrection, i.e. the "provisional vindication," while the second half points to the "final, public vindication" in Jesus' future return.

¹⁹⁶ With Gundry, *Apology*, 886.

¹⁹⁷ Juel, *Messiah*, 68 and 72.

¹⁹⁸ So also Bond, *Caiaphas*, 107.

¹⁹⁹ Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords: Mark 13 in Markan Eschatology* (JSNTSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 141-43, lists 35 different interpretations of the tearing of the temple veil. Much of the literature centers on which veil (the inner or outer) is in view here: e.g. Juel, *Messiah*, 140-42; Dale C. Allison, *The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1985), 30-33; Harry L. Chronis, "The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15:37-39," *JBL* 101 (1982): 97-114. One attractive suggestion is that the tearing is an indication of the destruction of the Jewish leaders and their temple, which harkens back to Mark 12 where the leaders are represented by the "tenants" who will be destroyed for their actions against the "beloved son." If the tearing of the veil indicates the destruction of the "tenants" in Mark, then it, (a) refers the reader back to Mark 12, and thus, to Jesus' citation of

however, primarily concerned with the meaning of the tearing of the veil *per se*, but rather with its function or place in the Markan narrative after Jesus' death, which serves as an indication of his vindication in the several ways explicated below.²⁰⁰

The narrative order of Jesus taking his last breath in Mark 15:37 followed by the tearing of the veil in two in 15:38 indicates that the latter event is a response to the former (i.e., Jesus' death). Hurtado sees a link in the loud cry of Mark 15:37 with the tearing of the temple veil, which immediately follows in 15:38.²⁰¹ This is supported by the presence of the conjunction καί, at the beginning of Mark 15:38, which suggests a linking of the two verses. This is in contrast to the presence of the disjunctive δε, at the beginning of Mark 15:37, which indicates a subtle distancing from 15:36, and another δε, immediately following in 15:39. While the significance of these words should not be exaggerated, it does at least suggest that Mark 15:37 and 15:38 should be considered together as events in close relationship to one another.²⁰²

If, then, the tearing of the temple veil is a response to Jesus' final cry from the cross, whose response is it? The sheer magnitude of the power required to achieve such a feat implies the miraculous nature of the sign, and suggests that God is the agent.²⁰³ This is also supported by the immediate context, where Jesus had previously called out to God in his moment of agony (Mark 15:34). This act of tearing (σχιζω) recalls the tearing open of the clouds of heaven at Jesus' baptism (Mark 1:10), where Jesus is validated by God as his beloved son. It is likely that Mark's implied readers would have also recalled this prior validation and would have understood this event as another validation of Jesus. God's validation of Jesus even at his moment of death also serves in the narrative as an implicit reminder that Jesus' death is not the end, i.e., that he will be raised just as he predicted many times

Ps 118, which; (b) proves that Jesus' predictions do come true and; (c) strongly indicates/anticipates Jesus' vindication as the "beloved son," which then; (d) may inform the placement and meaning of the centurion's statement immediately after the tearing of the temple veil. It is also interesting to note Juel's observation (*Messiah*, 137) that the Isaiah Targum interprets Isa 5:1-5 as a reference to the destruction of the temple, which may indicate another connection between these three passages.

²⁰⁰ This focus on the function of the passage in the narrative, rather than in the meaning of the tearing *per se*, is similar to Juel's "double-level narrative" in *Messiah*, 46-47.

²⁰¹ Hurtado, *Mark*, 268.

²⁰² The indentation of Mark 15:38 in NA²⁷ is misleading at this point.

²⁰³ So also Steichele, *Der leidende Sohn Gottes*, 257.

previously. Just as his prophetic predictions of the destruction of the temple and its leaders (Mark 11:12-21; 12:9; 13:2; 14:58) have been shown to be true in the symbolic tearing of the veil, so also will Mark's readers have confidence that his predictions of his resurrection and exaltation, the ultimate vindication, will take place just as he has said. In summary, the tearing of the temple veil in Mark serves as an indication of Jesus' vindication because it is, (a) a response to Jesus' death; (b) by God; (c) in the form of a miraculous event; (d) which is reminiscent of a prior event in which Jesus was validated by God (baptism); and (e) is followed by a positive response from another observer of Jesus' death (the centurion).²⁰⁴

Jesus' status as son of God is not only validated implicitly by God's tearing of the temple veil. The centurion by the cross recognizes the true identity of Jesus in **Mark 15:39**. The likelihood that the centurion's statement is a sincere one, rather than an inadvertent and ironic one,²⁰⁵ is supported by several elements in the Markan narrative itself. First, there is a complete absence of any negative portrayal of the centurion as an antagonist of Jesus in the narrative, although the other characters that ironically speak truths about Jesus' identity are clearly portrayed as his antagonists (Mark 8:31; 10:33, 34; 11:18; 12:12 [11:27]; 14:1,2; 14:10; 14:43; 14:53-65; 15:1-20; 15:29-32). Thus, unlike the high priest and the chief priests, Pilate, the soldiers, and those passing by the cross, the Markan narrative does not prepare the reader to expect the centurion to speak in such an ironic manner.²⁰⁶ Secondly, if Mark's PRN can be shown to follow the general "plot" of Ps 22, as will be demonstrated in Chapter 6, then this speech-act of the centurion may be symbolic of the "worship of the nations" that is anticipated in Ps 22:28. Thirdly, the placement of the statement in

²⁰⁴ Juel, *Messiah*, 169, also sees the temple charge in Mark 14:58 as one of the bases for Jesus' rejection by the Jewish leaders, and subsequently, on the "deeper" level of Mark's double narrative, one of the bases for his vindication. This is part of his larger argument that whatever Jesus was rejected for by the Jewish authorities he is also presented as being vindicated by God. Cf. his summary in *Messiah*, 56.

²⁰⁵ There are some who argue that the centurion's statement should be grouped with the other ironic statements presented on the lips of Jesus' enemies, such as the unwilling truths stated by the high priest (Mark 14:61), Pilate (15:2, 9, 12), the soldiers (15:18) and those surrounding the cross at Jesus' crucifixion (15:29-32). E. g. Earl S. Johnson, Jr., "Is Mark 15.39 the Key to Mark's Christology?" *JSNT* 31 (1987): 3-22; Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 289; Fowler, *Let the Reader*, 207.

²⁰⁶ *Contra* Fowler, *Let the Reader*, 207, all of the other soldiers in the PRN are clearly portrayed as antagonistic toward Jesus. If Mark is capable of making the villainy of these soldiers clear to the reader at this point, why would he not be just as clear about the centurion in Mark 15:39 if indeed he should be understood as one of their number?

its following on the heels of the miraculous tearing of the temple veil weighs against the likelihood that Mark intends his readers to understand the centurion's comment as one of sardonic irony like the others (none of which follow any display of power, but rather react to the weakness and vulnerability of Jesus). Surely the spectacular power demonstrated in this act would have evoked awe rather than sarcasm and doubt.²⁰⁷ Fourthly, the emphatic adverb in the centurion's statement (ἀληθῶς) is found only one other time in Mark (14:70), where some bystanders perceive who Peter truly is—a disciple of Jesus. There Mark presents the bystanders as speaking emphatically and in earnest—over against Peter's repeated denial that he is not a follower of Jesus (which the readers know is not true). Thus, in the only other instance of this adverb, Mark uses it to portray the speakers' words as trustworthy, i.e., ones that can be taken at face value, in contrast with the lies of Peter. I would argue, then, that the burden of proof is on those who would read the use of this adverb differently in Mark 15:39 to show that Mark intended his readers to understand this statement as one that is not spoken in earnest and is not to be taken at face value.²⁰⁸

However, it is not my intention to argue that Mark presents the centurion as grasping the *full import* of what he has exclaimed—this is not clear from the verse. Thus, it may well be ironic in the sense that the centurion does not fully grasp what he is saying or how his statement speaks to Jesus' identity as God's son, while still constituting a confession. This is the viewpoint of Juel, who argues that even if one takes the anarthrous υἱὸς θεοῦ to mean “a son of God” rather than “the Son of God,” his expression would have been understood by Christian readers who know Jesus' real identity as a true confession.²⁰⁹ In addition, as Juel underscores, the presence of the same anarthrous expression in Mark 1:1 (which is supported by such strong

²⁰⁷ Although the centurion is described as facing Jesus and not the temple, the sequence of the narrative suggests that his reaction is affected—and perhaps sparked—by the tearing of the veil recounted in the previous sentence. This may be further substantiated by Mark's use of the pronoun, which could be understood either as masculine (“opposite *Jesus*”) or neuter (“opposite the temple *veil*”). It is only in the following clause that Mark makes it clear that the pronoun refers to Jesus.

²⁰⁸ In response to Fowler, *Let the Reader*, 207, who argues that the ἀληθῶς of the centurion should not be trusted, is it not equally (if more!) probable that, even at the discourse level of the narrative, the “truly” may *truly* be significant?

²⁰⁹ Juel, *Messiah*, 83.

witnesses as ἄ¹, B, D, L, W, etc.), where it is clearly used as a christological title, suggests that the phrase in 15:39 would have been understood in the same way.²¹⁰

Thus, the centurion, like Mark's implied readers, is able to see beyond the apparent futility of Jesus' death. This positive statement concerning Jesus' identity moves the narrative closer to the event of the resurrection. Looking over the shoulder of the centurion, Mark's readers are even more privileged than the centurion in their knowledge of Jesus' future. The previous predictions in the narrative leading up to the passion which concern his vindication via resurrection have prepared the readers to expect God's reaffirmation of Jesus *beyond* the cross.

C. Conclusion: The Importance of Jesus' Resurrection in Mark's Gospel

As we have seen from our examination of the formal passion-resurrection predictions and the numerous other passages which deal with Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection, it is clear that the latter is a matter of great importance to Mark. Although Mark's focus on Jesus' path to the cross is perhaps the loudest voice of emphasis in the gospel narrative, the presence of the repeated linking of this death with the anticipation of Jesus' resurrection and vindication by God also cries out for the readers' attention. Thus, there exists throughout Mark's narrative a strand of thought that centers on the future events that will take place even after Jesus suffers and dies on the cross. This emphasis in Mark becomes an important key in understanding his PRN, especially the account of Jesus' crucifixion.

If the implied readers of Mark's gospel were prepared to anticipate that something would happen to Jesus beyond his death—as I believe the evidence of this chapter shows—then it is more probable that, when they approached his cry from the cross in Mark 15:34 and recognized it as a citation from Ps 22, they would have grasped the overlap of plots between the two stories. The fact that the psalmist experienced vindication after enduring persecution, and that Mark creates an anticipation of the same conclusion in Jesus' own experience amongst his implied readers provides a link in stories of the two protagonists. This Markan interest in

²¹⁰ So also Tae Hun Kim, "The Anarthrous υἱὸς θεοῦ in Mark 15,39 and the Roman Imperial Cult," *Bib* 79 (1998): 221-41; and Philip G. Davis, "Mark's Christological Paradox," *JSNT* 35 (1989): 3-18, who aptly notes that if Mark's anarthrous phrase would have caused confusion for his implied reader, the reader would not search for similar grammatical constructions to illumine the passage, but "would (have) read 15.39 consistently with previous references of Jesus' sonship to God" (11).

resurrection—an interest which is often disputed or ignored altogether by scholars—lends weight to the argument that Jesus’ citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 is pointing beyond itself in two respects. First, it is calling the implied reader’s attention to the remaining portion of the psalm, which recounts the sufferings of the speaker in detail and concludes with his rescue and vindication by God amongst his community. Second, by linking the plots of the intertext and his own narrative, Mark points his readers to God’s final impending answer to Jesus’ experience on the cross—resurrection and vindication/exaltation. The overall interest of Mark in what will happen to Jesus after his suffering and death provides one important strand of evidence that supports a contextual reading of Jesus’ citation of Ps 22:2.

In the following chapter, we will look at some additional support for this reading. If the argument that the citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 is contextual (rather than atomistic) is to be the most convincing, it would be helpful to uncover other contextual scriptural citations and allusions in Mark. A study of the general way Mark uses the scriptures as his intertext may result in one of three ways. It may: (1) indicate that Mark favors an atomistic use of the scriptures; (2) prove to be inconclusive, providing little indication of exactly how intertexts function in the narrative; or (3) indicate that Mark favors a contextual use of the scriptures. Chapter 4 will be composed of an examination of a representative sampling of passages where Mark appears to be using the scriptures. The aim of this survey will be to determine whether Mark most often cites or alludes to scripture atomistically or contextually. The outcome will either challenge or strengthen the thesis of this study—that Mark’s implied readers would have read and understood Jesus’ citation of Ps 22:2 in light of the entire context of Ps 22.

Chapter 4

Citation of and Allusion to the Scriptures in Mark's Gospel

The scriptures form an important background for Mark's gospel, especially with regard to his portrayal of Jesus.²¹¹ Scholars have found approximately 30 citations and as many as 200 allusions to the scriptures within the gospel!²¹² This chapter examines how the intertextual relationships between Mark and the scriptures help to infuse his gospel narrative with meaning. Is there a pattern that can be detected in Mark's use of the scriptures? Are his citations and allusions atomistic or are they contextual, i. e., does he intend the larger context of the scripture passage to inform its new context within his narrative? Or is there some combination of the two? The answers to these questions will be sought after with a view toward understanding how Mark uses the allusions and citation of several passages in Ps 22. If it can be convincingly argued that Mark sets a precedent by often intending his implied readers to read a certain passage with the larger context of the scripture in mind, then it increases the possibility that he is doing the same in Mark 15:34.

Using the definition of citation and the criteria for allusions set out in Chapter 2 of my study, this chapter will focus on a sample of scriptural citations and allusions chosen because they are, (a) dispersed throughout the Markan narrative; (b) taken from different genres within the scriptures (for example, the psalms, prophetic books, historical books); and (c) represent various uses of the scriptures with regard to original context, as will be shown in the course of the chapter. The goal of this exercise is to determine whether the surrounding context of the cited or allusive passage fits within its place in Mark's narrative, and whether this additional context

²¹¹ Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 213, also notes that the prevalence of scriptural use by the NT writers suggests that their readers and audiences also regarded the scriptures as authoritative and were sufficiently familiar with them to recognize their use: "The frequency, variety, and subtlety of Paul's recourse to scripture presume not only that the communities he addressed acknowledged the authority of Jewish scripture, but also that they were sufficiently familiar with it to understand and appreciate his appeals to it, subtle and diverse as they were. . . . Paul's letters are the best evidence for the question of the public reading of scripture in first-century Christianity (though he never mentions the subject) because he wrote to communities that were exclusively or predominantly Gentile, and if churches composed mainly of Gentiles were familiar with Jewish scripture, then all the more was that to be expected among Christian communities with larger Jewish constituencies. *The fact that virtually all the earliest Christian writers were deeply interested in Jewish scripture and gave it theological use presumes that their readers too were aware of scripture, acknowledged its authority, and knew its substance.*" Italics mine.

²¹² Hatina, *Search*, 1.

helps illumine the passage as a whole. Also of interest is whether there are any markers in the Markan passage that would indicate to his implied readers that the larger context of the scripture passage is in view.²¹³ Thus, the purpose of this exercise is to elucidate Mark's allusive technique, rather than to do strict exegesis on each passage.²¹⁴

The passages to be discussed are ordered according to their place in the Markan narrative. This format has several advantages. First, it presents the evidence concerning how Mark uses the scriptures in the order in which his implied readers would have read or heard it. Second, it underscores the diversity of Mark's use of the scriptures throughout the narrative by highlighting the presence of the different uses dispersed throughout the account of Jesus' ministry as well as in the PRN. Third, this order of examination helps resist the natural tendency to force and/or distort passages to fit into convenient categories, rather than taking them on their own terms. Only at the end of the chapter will these passages be grouped together and analyzed according to the results of our investigations.

Mark 1:2-3 (Mal 3:1; Exod 23:20; Isa 40:3)

The first passage to be examined is the problematic citation in the opening lines of Mark's gospel, a combined citation taken from three different books but

²¹³ Perri, "On Alluding," 299, argues that allusion requires a degree of sophistication and competence on the part of the reader not only because the allusion must be recognized, but because allusion requires the reader to "complete the allusion's unstated significance."

²¹⁴ Mark's *modus operandi* appears to be the same regarding his use of the scriptures in the PRN as well as in the other material. For example, the conflation of texts, the combination of texts that originally had nothing to do with each other (Kee, "Function," 181), the citation or allusion to scripture passages at the most crucial point in the story (Kee, "Function," 175), and the appeal to a wider context of the scriptural passage (see discussion below), all appear in Mark 1-13 and the PRN material. Thus, even if Mark inherited the PRN material from a pre-Markan passion tradition, he either, (a) intentionally adapted his use of the scriptures to fit how he perceived the passion tradition to use the scriptures; or (b) used the scriptures in a similar fashion independently of the other.

Absent from this sampling of citations and allusions are those which are *clearly* atomistic. This particular exercise will deal only with those that are not clearly atomistic or contextual at first glance.

attributed solely to “Isaiah the prophet.”²¹⁵ After using the first verse as the context in which to interpret the following,²¹⁶ Mark cites a conflation of Exod 23:20 and Mal 3:1 in Mark 1:2. The first reference is the easiest to identify because it follows almost verbatim the LXX version, leaving out only the connective *καί* and the emphatic *ἐγώ* in the LXX text. The source of the citation as Mal 3:1, however, is more difficult to discern, since it does not correspond with the LXX version:

LXX Mal 3:1: *καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου*

Mark 1:2b: *ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου*

On the basis of the verb change from *ἐπιβλέπω* to *κατασκευάζω*, several scholars conclude that Mark is using a Hebrew source, basing his translation on the *piel* of *פנה* (to prepare), while the LXX translation is derived from the *qal* (to survey, turn back, look).²¹⁷ On the heels of the conflated citation comes a citation from LXX Isa 40:3, with the only change coming at the end of the verse, where Mark substitutes *αὐτοῦ* for *τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν*.

The placement of these citations at the very beginning of Mark’s gospel underscores the importance that Mark gives them for interpreting his narrative. In addition, their connection with his introductory verse, which presents to the reader the main protagonist of his story, Jesus Christ, indicates that they provide a type of “first impression” of this character and a context in which to understand Mark’s narrative.

Given the importance of these citations for the gospel as a whole, it is important to ask whether the opening sentences of Mark’s gospel should be interpreted in light of the larger contexts of the citations from the scriptures. In

²¹⁵ Some manuscripts (A, W, *f*¹³, Maj, for example) have rectified the “problem” by replacing *ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ* with *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις*.

²¹⁶ The absence of a verb in the opening line suggests that “the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, son of God” is the promise found in the citation itself. See Marcus, *Way*, 17-21; Robert A. Guelich, “The Beginning of the Gospel: Mark 1:1-15,” *BR* 27 (1982): 5-15, for an argument that *καθὼς γέγραπται* forms the transition between Mark 1:1 and 1:2-3.

²¹⁷ E.g. Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), 47-54; Marcus, *Way*, 12-14; Hatina, *Search*, 144-45.

support of this are R. Watts and J. Marcus, both of whom draw similar conclusions, but in different ways.²¹⁸

From the outset, Watts consistently appeals to the larger contexts of the scriptural passages to which Mark alludes or cites. With respect to Mark 1:2-3, Watts sees an important connection between the respective contexts of the citations from Exodus, Malachi, and Isaiah in the theme of God's deliverance. The context of the Exodus passage is God's promise to Israel that he will provide a messenger that will lead them out of the wilderness and into the land (Exod 23:20-33). This is contingent, however, on the peoples' faithfulness to the covenant that Moses lays out in the Book of the Covenant (Exod 20:22-23:33), the larger setting in which the passage is located, and whether they are attentive to and listen to God's messenger (πρόσχε and εισάκουε, Exod 23:21). The Malachi passage also speaks of a messenger from God but, unlike the messenger of Exod 23:20, this messenger will come to prepare the way for God to bring judgment upon the Levitical priests who cheat him and his people (Mal 3:2-9).²¹⁹ And although there is a message of hope and deliverance for those who obey God (Mal 3:10-12), it is not clear whether the messenger has a role in this deliverance. The only explicit purpose of the messenger in this passage is to clear the way for God's judgment (Mal 3:1-4), which then leads to the deliverance of his people from the hands of their oppressors. The larger context of Isa 40:3 is similar to the Malachi passage as well, since it speaks of the hope of God's coming to restore his people from their oppressors (Babylon). The role of the "voice" (φωνή) in Isa 40:3, like the messenger of Malachi, is to prepare the way for the coming of God to bring judgment on oppressors and deliverance for his people.

There are, however, some significant differences between the larger contexts of each passage cited. For example, both contexts of Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3 are concerned with proclaiming *God's* arrival, while the context of Exod 23:20 relays God's promise to send a messenger who will prepare the way for the arrival of *his people*. In addition, it is not clear from the context of Mal 3:1 that the prophet is

²¹⁸ Marcus, *Way*, 17-47; Watts, *New Exodus*, 63-84, although it should be noted that both Watts and Marcus see the context of Isaiah (especially Deutero-Isaiah) as the primary interpretive context in which Mark places his gospel, as the titles to their respective monographs indicate.

²¹⁹ The motif of God's judgement of the religious authorities is a theme that is found throughout Mark's gospel (e. g., Mark 11:15-19 [and perhaps 11:12-14, 20-26]; 12:1-12) and overlaps with Mal 3:3, 4.

thinking of a New Exodus (in the manner of Isaiah), since his “preparation” is for the judgment of the Levitical priesthood and not for God’s restorative campaign from Babylon to Jerusalem.²²⁰ The theme of deliverance, then, may be too broad a category with which to justify an appeal to the larger contexts of the verses cited in Mark 1:2, 3.

Marcus argues that the presence of the transitional καθὼς γέγραπται underscores the link between the εὐαγγέλιον of Mark 1:1 and the conflated “Isaiah” citations, where εὐαγγέλιον is a main theme throughout Deutero-Isaiah and especially Isa 40:9-10, and he therefore suggests that the larger Isaianic context is meant to inform and interpret the whole of Mark’s gospel.²²¹ Marcus’ position for the influence of the larger Isaianic context also stands on the meaning of the Targum version of Isa 40:9, which reads אֶת־גְּלוֹיֹתָא מַלְכוּתָא דְּאַלְהֵיכוֹ, “the kingly power of your God has been revealed,”²²² rather than the LXX ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν, “Behold your God.” This allows him to detect a thematic connection between the Markan and Isaianic contexts in Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom of God in Mark 1:15 and the similar proclamation in *Tg. Isa.* 40:9.

The fact that the concept of “gospel” plays so prominently in both Mark’s opening section (1:1, 15) and Isa 40 gives weight to the argument that the larger context of the Isaianic passage is in view here. However, it does not address whether the contexts of Exod 23:20 and Mal 3:1 should also have an impact on the interpretation of this passage. Although this may not concern Marcus, considering his view that it is Isaiah which provides Mark with the overall framework for his use of the scriptures, one who does not adopt Marcus’ larger argument is left unsatisfied with an explanation that deals with only one of the three passages.²²³ In addition, Marcus’ reliance on the Targum to find a thematic connection between Mark 1:15 and Isa 40:9 is questionable, considering that the citation of Isa 40:3 appears to come almost verbatim from the LXX version.

²²⁰ Along with Hatina, *Search*, 147-48.

²²¹ Marcus, *Way*, 18-21. The participle εὐαγγελιζόμενος is found in Isa 40:9.

²²² Marcus, *Way*, 20. His translation.

²²³ Klyne R. Snodgrass, “Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and Their Adaptation in the New Testament,” *JSNT* 8 (1980): 24-45, also argues that the larger context of Isaiah 40, specifically Isa 40:1-5, is in view here, due to the tradition of Jewish interpreters to view this passage as an integrated whole which is connected by the theme of the divine promise of eschatological comfort.

A major argument that has been raised against the interpretation of Mark 1:2-3 in light of the citations' larger contexts is the possibility that Mark may not even have been aware that the entire citation does not belong to Isaiah.²²⁴ If sufficient doubt can be maintained that Mark was aware that a portion of his citation comes from Exodus and Malachi (as may be indicated by his attribution of the entire citation to Isaiah), then there would be no grounds for arguing that Mark intended the larger contexts of all three passages to enhance his introduction. Although it is possible that Mark was not aware of the references to Exod 23:20 and Mal 3:1 (i.e. his attribution of the citations to Isaiah indicates that he was confused about his sources or that he was working from a *testimonium* which already contained a conflation unbeknownst to him), this is unlikely for several reasons. First, as C. Stanley has demonstrated, conflation was not a contentious literary device in his day, but was an accepted, intentional, and relatively common practice, so the presence of one here should not imply that Mark was necessarily ignorant or confused.²²⁵ Second, throughout his narrative, Mark's other uses of the scriptures suggest that he was a more astute user of scripture than is often credited him.²²⁶ Third, the fact that Mark recognizes the verbal link between Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3 in the Hebrew פִּנָּה might indicate that his ascription of these texts to Isaiah is not out of ignorance, but out of theological intentionality.²²⁷

Both Marcus and Watts see the Isaiah text as the connecting point between the Exodus and Malachi citations and Mark's presentation of the gospel. In other words, the respective contexts of each citation are read through the larger lens of Deutero-Isaiah. Without bringing this larger interpretive framework to bear on this passage, it is not immediately clear that Mark regards the larger contexts of these three passages as programmatic for understanding either Mark 1:2-3 alone or his narrative as a whole. Perhaps the sheer number of his citations and allusions to other portions of Isaiah in the remainder of his narrative (*recurrence*) would have

²²⁴ E.g. Hatina, *Search*, 148.

²²⁵ Stanley, *Paul*, 342.

²²⁶ One example of his astuteness might be his more subtle use of scripture by allusion, rather than by a more rigid (and obvious) formulaic use, as Matthew employs. Stanley, *Paul*, 273-74, has shown that by including allusions in their works, ancient authors were essentially complimenting their readers by assuming their ability to recognize them.

²²⁷ Marcus, *Way*, 17. Marcus uses this argument as a springboard into his view that Isaiah forms the major scriptural background from which Mark presents his gospel.

eventually led his early readers to regard this book as a larger context from which to interpret his gospel as a whole.²²⁸ However, the position of these citations at the beginning of the narrative leaves almost no narrative context with which to make these decisions. It may indeed be the case that the “messenger” of Exod 23:20 and Mal 3:1 (*shared vocabulary*) and the “preparation” in Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3 (*shared circumstance*) provided Mark with the language he needed to present both John and Jesus as ones sent by God and to convey the former as the forerunner of the latter. On the other hand, along with Marcus and Watts, the very presence of these citations at the beginning of Mark’s narrative may indicate that there is more context implied here than meets the eye. Even so, Mark’s attribution of these citations solely to Isaiah is a strong indication that, if there is any larger context in view, it is Isaiah’s and not Exodus’ or Malachi’s.²²⁹ At any rate, it is unclear whether the larger context behind any of these citations is in view here.

Mark 5:1-20 (Exod 14:21-15:21)

The story of Jesus’ healing of the Gerasene demoniac is one of the most dramatic and captivating in the entire gospel. The passage is interspersed with several motifs both within the narrative (e.g., “strength,” ἰσχυρός, ἰσχύω, is a theme previously encountered in the Beelzebul controversy of Mark 3:20-30) and without (e.g., the use of “swine” in Greek and Roman idol worship).²³⁰ However, it is the story’s affinities with the Exodus account which will be examined below. First, however, we must take a look at the story’s immediate context in Mark’s narrative.

After telling several parables to the crowds (Mark 4:1-34), Jesus and his disciples leave them by sailing to the other side of the sea, an act which provides an opportunity for Jesus to work yet another miracle in the calming of a storm (4:35-

²²⁸ Mark 1:2; 4:12; 7:6; 11:17; 12:1-9; 13:24, 25.

²²⁹ This attribution may also reflect the fact that Deutero-Isaiah was repeatedly used as a resource for early Christian christology: so Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 378; Richard Bauckham, *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1998), 47-77; Franklin W. Young, “A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel,” *ZNW* 46 (1955):215-33. Thus, Mark would likely have presumed his readers to have already regarded Isaiah 40-55 as a christological text.

²³⁰ Franz Annen, *Heil für die Heiden: Zur Bedeutung und Geschichte der Tradition vom besessenen Gerasener (Mk 5,1-20 parr.)* (Frankfurter theologische Studien 20; Frankfurt am Main: Joseph Knecht, 1976), 133-81.

41). The power of Jesus to wield the wind and the waves leaves his followers in awe, and provokes their musings about his identity (Mark 4:41). Mark's next scene answers exactly this question (5:7), the answer (both in word and deed, 5:6) coming from the very unclean spirits (τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα) who are wreaking havoc on the Gerasene man. At the request of "Legion," Jesus does not cast them out of the country, but sends them into a herd of swine on the hill, an act that drives the swine into the sea and drowns them.

What elements of the story indicate an allusion to the Exodus crossing of the Red Sea? One could argue that, since there is no distinctive shared vocabulary between the two accounts, there is no allusion to the Exodus event at all. However, there are several parallels involving the setting, characters, and plot of each story, similarities which indicate an allusion to an entire event rather than a singular passage.²³¹

Each story takes place near (and in!) a "sea" (θάλασσα) and in a Gentile land. There is also evidence of military imagery in Mark's account both in the Latinism λεγιών (5:9) and in the description of the group of pigs as an ἀγέλη ("herd"; 5:11, 13), a term that could also be used for a group of military recruits.²³² This imagery is reminiscent of the military setting of the conflict between the army of Pharaoh and the Israelite camp. In the Markan story, it is the demons who, like Pharaoh, enslave the Gerasene and meet their ruin by rushing down the hill and drowning into the sea.²³³ And just as it was God who orchestrated the demise of Pharaoh's army, it is Jesus as son of God who has both the power to control all that takes place in the story and the power over the unclean spirits and the herd of swine.²³⁴ Lastly, although he does not remain in the restraints in which the locals try to place him (Mark 5:3-4), the Gerasene is presented as one in bondage to demons, and it is Jesus who frees him from that bondage—an act he attributes to the mercy of the Lord (5:19). This recalls

²³¹ See my discussion of this type of allusion in Chapter 2.

²³² J. Duncan M. Derrett, "Contributions to the Study of the Gerasene Demoniac," *JSNT* 3 (1979): 5-6.

²³³ Derrett, "Contributions," 5-6, argues that ὤρμησεν could also be used to describe troops rushing into battle.

²³⁴ It is clear that Mark does not present Jesus as merely a vessel through whom God works (the role of Moses in the Exodus account), since, (a) Jesus has just been presented in Mark 4:35-41 as having power over the wind and the sea itself, just as God demonstrated his power over them (Exod 15:8-10); and (b) the unclean spirits recognize the authority of Jesus as son of God (Mark 5:7) and that he has power to do what he wishes with them (5:10).

Moses' words in the Song of the Sea, where he describes God's deliverance of his people from oppression by leading them into the land as evidence of his הִסְדָּר (LXX δικαιοσύνη, Exod 15:13).

This type of allusion (*shared circumstances*) necessarily requires the reader to interpret the new story in light of the larger context of the old, since it is an allusion that encompasses several aspects of the former story, including characterization, setting, and plot.²³⁵ How would Mark's allusion to the Exodus story have illumined this portion of the narrative for his implied readers? First, it presents Jesus as one who possesses Godly powers, which is even more striking when combined with Mark's repeated depiction of Jesus as son of God (1:11; 5:7, and later in 9:7). Second, it places a Gentile in the position of the Israelites, therefore underscoring God's concern to offer salvation to Gentiles, and more specifically, to the "unclean." Third, the juxtaposition of this story with the narrative of Jesus' calming of the storm (Mark 4:35-41) may underscore the presence of the Divine-Warrior motif, a characterization of God found in Moses' Song (Exod 15:1-18, but especially vv. 1-10).²³⁶ Thus it is primarily the identification of Jesus with God that is illumined by the Exodus allusion in Mark 5:1-20.

Mark 5:22-24, 35-45 (1 Kgs 17:17-24; 2 Kgs 4:32-37)

Following immediately on the heels of Jesus' healing of the Gerasene demoniac, Jesus crosses back over the sea and is soon approached by a synagogue official, Jairus, who asks Jesus to heal his daughter from a sickness that threatens to kill her. The story of Jairus' daughter picks up again in Mark 5:35, after the intercalation of the healing of the woman with the flow of blood, with the announcement that the girl has died. Jesus, however, denies that this is the case, claiming that the girl is only sleeping, and proceeds up to the child's room and heals her.

²³⁵ See my treatment of allusions to events in Chapter 2.

²³⁶ Watts, *New Exodus*, 161. Its proximity to the account of Jesus' walking on the sea (Mark 6:45-52), which presents Jesus as possessing the same power to "trample the sea," as that of Yahweh (Job 9:8; Hab 3:8,15) may be a further indication of the close identification (or "assimilation") of Jesus with God; so Barry Blackburn, *Theios Anēr and the Markan Miracle Traditions: A Critique of the Theios Anēr Concept as an Interpretative Background of the Miracle Traditions Used by Mark* (WUNT Reihe 2:40; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991), 145-52, 176-82.

Like the story that precedes it, this account of the healing of Jairus' daughter alludes to the scriptures, but in this case, there appears to be an allusion to two similar scriptural healing stories: Elijah's healing of the widow's son in Zarephath (1 Kgs 17:17-24), and Elisha's healing of the Shunammite woman's son (2 Kgs 4:32-37). Once again, Mark's allusive narrative has points of contact with the respective events of these passages of scripture, as well as the presentation of the main characters (*shared circumstances*).

Like the stories in Kings, Mark's account centers on a sick child who appears to die from illness (Mark 5:35; 1 Kgs 17:18; 2 Kgs 4:31-32). In both the Elisha story and the Markan account, it is a parent that approaches the healer, falls at his feet,²³⁷ and asks for his intervention (Mark 5:22; 2 Kgs 4:27-30; it is also possible that the widow's hostile confrontation of Elijah serves the same purpose, 1 Kgs 17:18). Like Elisha, Jesus also enters the child's room and closes the door, keeping the mourners out of the way of his work (Mark 5:40; 2 Kgs 4:33).²³⁸ All three stories end with the same result: the prophet raises the child from the dead and returns him/her to the parents (Mark 5:41-42; 1 Kgs 17:23; 2 Kgs 4:36).²³⁹

From our analysis above, it is clear that the Markan account has more affinities with the Elisha story than that of Elijah.²⁴⁰ This is consistent with the Elijah/Elisha theme that is present throughout Mark's narrative in which he presents John the Baptist as the Elijah figure, the forerunner of Jesus (Mark 1:6; 9:10-13). This paradigm of John and Jesus as Elijah and Elisha figures present at the beginning of Mark's narrative would likely have aided the implied reader in his recognition of

²³⁷ In the MT and LXX, the verbs indicate a seizing or catching hold of Elisha's feet (פָּדַח, ἐπιλαμβάνω), but the sense is essentially the same in the Markan account, since the MT/LXX verbs still imply an action of falling at the feet.

²³⁸ Although Elisha does not even allow the child's mother in to the room while he raises the child.

²³⁹ Another intriguing connection with Mark's narrative and the Elijah story is the identical exclamation (directed to the prophet) of the widow (LXX 1 Kgs 17:18) and the demons in Mark's preceding story (5:7): τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; "What have you to do with me?," an idiom found nowhere else in Mark and only four times in the LXX, two of which are in the Kings material (Judg 11:12; 1 Kgs 17:18; 2 Kgs 3:13; 2 Chr 35:21). Is Mark preparing his readers for the following allusion to the Elijah story?

²⁴⁰ Although this distinction may be somewhat superficial if both the Elijah and Elisha account represent two versions of one basic story. See Hermann-Josef Stipp, "Vier Gestalten einer Totenerweckungserzählung (1 Kön 17,17-24; 2 Kön 4,8-37; Apg 9,36-42; Apg 20,7-12)," *Bib* 80 (1999): 43-77.

the allusions in this portion of the narrative. In addition, the prior familiarity with the stories in Kings would have led the reader to anticipate a similar outcome in Mark's account in the raising of the girl from the dead.

Mark 8:17, 18 (Jer 5:21; Exod 4:21; 7:3; 14:4, 7; Ps 95:8; Isa 63:17)

Mark's adaptation of Jer 5:21 comes at a point when Jesus is feeling intense frustration towards his disciples' lack of understanding and faith. After the Pharisees approach Jesus to test him by requesting from him a sign and Jesus sends them away with a flat denial, Jesus and his disciples get back in the boat to head to the other side. While on their way, the disciples become concerned because they only have one loaf of bread. Jesus uses this opportunity to provide an object lesson for the incident that has just happened with the Pharisees. He warns them to beware of (ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε) the leaven of the Pharisees and Herod (Mark 8:15). As is typical of the Markan portrayal of the disciples, they do not understand Jesus' warning, perhaps still preoccupied with their stomachs!²⁴¹ It is here that Mark cites a form of Jer 5:21 that is either his own adaptation or derives from an unknown Hebrew *Vorlage*:

ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε καὶ ὦτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε;

“Having eyes do you not perceive and having ears do you not understand?”²⁴²

The scriptural context of this passage is God's indictment of Judah for forsaking him in the favor of foreign gods (Jer 5:19). Therefore God promises that his people will soon incur judgment for their idolatry in the form of Babylonian oppressors. It is at this point that he accuses the people for not seeing with their eyes and hearing with their ears, equating this with foolishness and senselessness (Jer 5:21). God then proceeds to explain to them one reason why they should fear him, because he has power over the sea to keep it within its boundaries and to prevail over

²⁴¹ Mark 4:13.

²⁴² The LXX follows the syntax of the MT version identically: ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν ὦτα αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐκ ἀκούουσιν, וְעֵינֵיהֶם לֹא יֵרְאוּ אֲזַנֵּיהֶם לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ, וְעֵינֵיהֶם לֹא יֵרְאוּ אֲזַנֵּיהֶם לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ.

the waves (Jer 5:22). Jeremiah's prophecy continues with an accounting of their sins against the Lord and his promise to punish them for it (5:23-31).

Did Mark intend the larger context of the scripture to have any bearing on his narrative at this point? There is at least one significant difference between the two contexts: Jeremiah is concerned with the judgment of the people's apostasy, an issue that is clearly not in view in Mark's narrative. It is possible that the shared concepts of understanding and perception that pervade each context are primarily what led Mark to incorporate this citation in his narrative.

Yet there is one interesting connection between the two, specifically between the Jeremiah context and the larger context of Mark 4-8. As mentioned above, the following verse in Jeremiah recounts the fearful might of God in his power over the sea. In the preceding accounts of the calming of the storm and his walking on water, Jesus is also presented as one who has this power (Mark 4:35-41; 6:45-52). In addition, it is in the context of the former story that Jesus comments upon the disciples' lack of faith (Mark 4:40), a similar accusation to the one made in Mark 8:17-21. And it is likely no coincidence that these two "sea" stories sandwich the story of the feeding of the 5,000 (Mark 6:30-44), an account closely resembling that of Mark 8:1-10, which sparks Jesus' comments about the leaven of the religious leaders in the present narrative. Jesus even reminds them of the two feeding miracles in order to underscore the depth of their lack of understanding (Mark 8:19-20).

The fact that the Markan Jesus has previously accused the disciples of having hardened hearts in Mark 8:17 (*shared vocabulary*, πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν) just before the Jeremiah citation draws in the context of the Exodus story through allusion to this key theme in the account (and in subsequent passages in the scriptures which refer to the Exodus story, cf. LXX Ps 94:8; Isa 63:17, where Israel is portrayed as having hardened hearts like Pharaoh).²⁴³ In the Exodus account this portrayal of Pharaoh's hardness of heart (Exod 4:21; 7:3; 14:4, 17) indicates his obstinate disobedience to God's revelation through Moses. Similarly, Jesus accuses his disciples of stubbornly failing to understand the significance of his miracles (Mark 8:19, 20) as also revealing God's power and work through Jesus himself. The

²⁴³ Although the verb used in the LXX is a different one, σκληρύνω, the allusion would hardly have been lost on Mark's implied readers since, (a) both verbs indicate stubbornness; and (b) the combination of the verb with καρδία would have immediately brought the Exodus story to mind.

allusion to the Exodus story also reinforces the presentation of Jesus as one who has power over the sea in Mark 4-8 (*shared circumstances*).

Thus, the settings of the prominent events in Mark 4-8 and the characterization of Jesus which they provide intersect with the themes of perception, understanding, hardened hearts, and power over the sea that pervade the Markan context, the larger context of Jer 5:21, and the scriptures which refer to the Exodus account. It is highly possible, then, that Mark arranged his narrative in such a way that his implied readers would make these underlying connections, perhaps to underscore the serious consequences for failing to perceive and understand the true identity of Jesus.

Mark 11:17 (Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11)

This passage comes at a crucial and tension-filled moment in Mark's narrative. Following on the heels of his triumphant arrival into Jerusalem (Mark 11:7-11), Jesus heads to the temple a second time on the following day. Perhaps Mark was preparing his readers to anticipate the negative tenor of Jesus' actions on this day (as compared to the previous one) by his account of Jesus' cursing of the fig tree on the way to the temple (11:12-14) and its withering on the way out (11:20). At any rate, despite its traditional description as the "cleansing" of the temple, the Markan Jesus' following actions and words in the temple suggest something more hostile than a mere "spring cleaning"!²⁴⁴ After driving out the temple merchants and their customers and ransacking the tables and chairs of the moneychangers and those who sell pigeons, Jesus begins to teach the crowds (Mark 11:15-17). Mark records (some of²⁴⁵) Jesus' words as a combination of a direct citation from LXX Isa 56:7 and a phrase from LXX Jer 7:11:

²⁴⁴ Most scholars concur that the intercalation of the cursing of the fig tree and Jesus' actions in the temple are meant to be mutually interpretive, and thus indicate a foreshadowing of the destruction to come. For an entry into this discussion see William R. Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig-Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and Its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980); Morna D. Hooker, "Traditions about the Temple in the Sayings of Jesus," *BJRL* 70 (1988): 7-20; E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1985), 61-76; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?," *CBQ* 51 (1989): 237-70. Cf. Gundry, *Apology*, 671-682, for a rebuttal of Telford's argument.

²⁴⁵ It is likely that Mark's use of the verb διδάσκω is an indication to his readers that Jesus spoke more words than what Mark has recorded. This is further substantiated if one takes ἐδίδασκειν to

ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν
 ὑμεῖς δὲ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον ληστῶν.
My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations
 but you have made it *a hideout of robbers*.

The larger context of Isa 56 addresses the place of the nations in the worship of God. In Isa 56:1-8, the prophet relates God's command to include those from other nations (ὁ ἄλλογενής) in central acts of worship such as the keeping of the sabbath (Isa 56:6) and the offering of sacrifices and burnt offerings (56:7) on the altar. They are even described as God's δούλους (Isa 56:6). The worship of God by the nations is an indication of the radical inclusiveness that is anticipated in the restoration of the temple in Isa 55-66.²⁴⁶ Thus, Isa 55-66 presents an offer of salvation to the nations, and indicates an opportunity for them to serve God in the temple, anticipating a subversion of the distinctions between foreigners and God's people.

In Jer 7:8-26, God dictates to Jeremiah his message of accusation and judgment for the people concerning their treatment of the temple. By practicing sin freely and then fleeing to the temple and participating in sacrifices in order to avoid the consequences of their actions, the Israelites have been treating God's house as if it were a hideout of robbers (Jer 7:8-11). Thus, God will judge them for their actions, just as he judged the former house of worship in Shiloh (Jer 7:12-15, 20), a judgment that will result in destruction.

There are several indications in Mark's narrative that the contexts of Isa 56 and Jer 7 are in view here. First, there are similarities between the characterization of those who misuse the temple in Jer 7 and the presentation of the Jewish authorities in Mark's gospel. Both groups refuse to listen to and obey the words of God through

be an inceptive (ingressive, inchoative) imperfect, "he *began* to teach." It may also explain the crowds' amazement at his teaching in Mark 11:18, which is not the first time Jesus has produced this effect in Mark's narrative (1:22; 6:2). See Holly J. Carey, "Teachings and Tirades: Jesus' Temple Act and His Teachings in Mark 11:15-19," *SCJ* 10:1 (2007): 93-105.

²⁴⁶ See Watts, *New Exodus*, 318-22, for his discussion of the Isaianic New Exodus and the temple. Watts notes that, in addition to inclusiveness and universalism, there is also a condemnation of those nations who resist God's exaltation of Israel (Isa 60:12).

his prophets (Jer 7:13; Mark 8:11,12; 11:18, 27-33), while choosing to act on their own inclinations (Jer 7:24; Mark 3:6), and mistake cultic practice for genuine obedience to God (Jer 7:10; Mark 2:24; 3:2-4; 7:1-13).²⁴⁷

Second, Mark uses the same term ληστής found in Jer 7:11 and Mark 11:17 as a foil to Jesus' ministry and activities (14:48) and for the two criminals that were crucified next to Jesus (15:27). Another possible connotation of the term is "insurrectionist," evidenced by Josephus' use of the term to describe those in league with the Zealots (Josephus, *J. W.* 2.651-53; 4.238-54).²⁴⁸ This makes sense in the context of the crucifixion scene, since it was not customary for common criminals to experience crucifixion, a punishment which was usually reserved for political threats to Rome.²⁴⁹ This, in addition to the juxtaposition of Jer 7:11 with Isa 56 in Mark 11, may indicate that Mark is using this word with these political and nationalistic connotations. If so, this ties in well with the context of Isa 56, where "these insurrectionists have put their nationalist agendas ahead of Yahweh's INE intention that his house be a place of prayer for all nations."²⁵⁰ The agenda of these ληστής, then, is contradictory to God's universalistic plan as expressed in Isa 56.

By juxtaposing the citation of Isa 56:7 and alluding to Jer 7:11, it appears that Mark is presenting Jesus as a prophet (like Isaiah and Jeremiah) who condemns the authorities and/or the people for not using the temple in the manner in which it was intended, as a place of worship for all peoples, and thus condemns the temple itself to destruction. In this case, the larger contexts of Isa 56 and Jer 7 do indeed illumine the Markan passage, addressing issues beyond a surface critique of the economic practices of the temple by labeling its authorities as insurrectionists whose agenda threatens to thwart the universal salvation of God. As Watts' points out, it is not surprising, then, that the authorities immediately begin plotting Jesus' death (Mark 11:18) after he has implicitly attacked their authority and practices, branded them as

²⁴⁷ Watts, *New Exodus*, 328.

²⁴⁸ N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 2; London: SPCK, 1996), 419-20; and Juel, *Messiah*, 132, also argue for this reading.

²⁴⁹ Francis Watson, "Why Was Jesus Crucified?," *Theology* 88 (1985): 105-12; Joel B. Green, "Death of Jesus," *DJG* 1:146-63.

²⁵⁰ Watts, *New Exodus*, 329. For Watts, "INE," refers to the New Exodus anticipated by the prophet Isaiah.

insurrectionists, and forewarned the destruction of the temple by alluding to the same threat in Jer 7.²⁵¹

Mark 12:1-12 (Isa 5:1-2; Ps 118:22-23)

The “parable of the tenants” in Mark 12:1-9 is the last parable before his PRN. The fact that Mark concludes this parable with Jesus’ citation from the psalms is another indication of the importance of this parable for his narrative. We will examine each scripture reference in turn, beginning with Mark’s allusion to Isa 5:1-2 in the opening sentence of the parable.

Whether Mark’s allusion to Isa 5:1-2 is derived from the MT or the LXX is a matter of debate.²⁵² Obvious differences between the two versions are: (a) the presentation of the speech entirely in the first person (LXX), as opposed to the alternating first and third person (MT),²⁵³ (b) the description of the land as an existing plot transformed into a vineyard (LXX), rather than as virgin soil needing to be cleared (MT); and (c) the problem as being one of weeds (LXX), as opposed to one of bad grapes (MT).²⁵⁴ Thus, J. Kloppenborg sees more similarities in Mark’s allusion with the LXX than the MT. This may be the case, but do either these differences between the two or the definitive answer concerning the source of Mark’s allusion actually change the way he uses the allusion to suit his purposes in the narrative? I would argue that these factors do not change the interpretation of Jesus’ parable significantly. First, Mark’s allusion comes in the context of a parable, which is necessarily put in the third person, following neither the LXX nor the MT. Second, whether the land used for the vineyard is virgin soil or has been used before is not important to the story of the parable. Third, Mark freely alters the characters and

²⁵¹ Watts, *New Exodus*, 329.

²⁵² See the running dialogue between John S. Kloppenborg, “Egyptian Viticultural Practices and the Citation of Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9,” *NovT* 44 (2002):134-59; Kloppenborg, “Isa 5:1-7 LXX,” 12-19; and Craig A. Evans, “How Septuagintal is Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9?” *NovT* 45 (2003), 105-10.

²⁵³ Gary R. Williams, “Frustrated Expectations in Isaiah V 1-7: A Literary Interpretation,” *VT* 35 (1985): 459-65, argues that this is a literary device that is designed to keep the audience guessing as to the identity of “the vineyard.”

²⁵⁴ According to Kloppenborg, “Isa 5:1-7 LXX,” 13-14, the presence of weeds in the LXX version indicates the neglect of tenants.

components of the story so that the concern clearly does not have to do with the yield of the land but the injustice of the tenants themselves.²⁵⁵

Aside from the opening description of the planting and protecting of the vineyard, are there any parallels to the rest of the account in Isa 5:1-7 and its larger context? There are, in fact, quite a few. First, the owner of both vineyards turns out to be God (Isa 5:3; Mark 12:6).²⁵⁶ Second, both the Isaianic speech and the parable are told in such a way as to provoke the audience (Judah, Isa 5:7; and the religious authorities, Mark 11:27) to condemn the perpetrators, i.e., “the vineyard” (which is presented as an adulterous wife in the Isaianic passage) and the tenants in the Markan narrative. G. Williams notes that Isaiah’s audience, the people of Judah, would have understood this adulterous wife to be a reference to Israel, just as Hosea and Ps 80 speak of Israel using vineyard language.²⁵⁷ Yet both the speech and the parable are structured in such a way as to reveal to them, in the very midst of their pretentious condemnation of others, that *they* are indeed the very perpetrators of the crime (Isa 5:7; Mark 12:12)!²⁵⁸ Both the speech and the parable, then, contradict the audience’s “horizon of expectation” in directing the condemnation at them rather than at others.²⁵⁹ Third, as in Isaiah, the father expects justice (he anticipates that the tenants will respect his beloved son), but instead sees bloodshed (Mark 12:6; Isa 5:7 מִשְׁפָּח; LXX, ἀνομία “lawlessness”). In response to this injustice, God will punish those who have offended him (Mark 12:9; Isa 5:15). In Isaiah, this judgment will come in the form of exile, which brings with it the destruction of the temple, a theme that pervades the following chapter of Mark’s narrative.²⁶⁰ The presence of these

²⁵⁵ In a similar argument, Bayer, *Predictions*, 103, emphasizes that the parable and the psalmic citation is focused on the tenants, i.e. the “present generation of rejectors.”

²⁵⁶ This becomes clear during the course of the parable, specifically with the language of the “beloved son” (cf. Mk 1:11; 9:7).

²⁵⁷ Williams, “Frustrated,” 460.

²⁵⁸ Thus the reaction of the religious leaders in Mark 12:12.

²⁵⁹ Hans R. Jauss, *Towards an Aesthetic of Reception* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982), uses the term “horizon of expectation” to speak of the viewpoint which a reader brings to a text based on his/her own context and worldview. Anthony C. Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 34, notes that many of Jesus’ parables function(ed) to “shatter, eclipse, or transform the horizon of expectation of the reader (audience).” For a more detailed study of this function of Jesus’ parables, see Anthony C. Thiselton, “The Parables as Language-Event: Some Comments on Fuchs’s Hermeneutics in the Light of Linguistic Philosophy,” *SJT* 23 (1970): 437-68.

²⁶⁰ Rikk Watts, “The Psalms in Mark’s Gospel,” in *The Psalms in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; London: T & T Clark International, a Continuum imprint, 2004), 25-45,

connections in plot (*shared circumstances*) and emphasis suggests that the larger context of Isa 5 is implied by Mark's narrative.

At the conclusion of the parable, Jesus cites Ps 118:22-23 (LXX Ps 117:22-23):

λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες
οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας
²³ παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη
καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν

(The) stone which the builders rejected

this one has become (the) head of the corner

This came about from the Lord

and is marvelous in our eyes.

This citation functions several ways in the Markan context. It identifies the characters of the parable with the characters of the psalm (the builders = the tenants; the stone = the son; the Lord = the father).²⁶¹ It also locates the persecution of the son/stone within the prerogative of the father/God. The use of the multivalent θαυμαστὴ both underscores the astonishing nature of the act of God in sending his son²⁶² and anticipates the miraculous outcome that will come from this rejection of the son, i.e. resurrection/vindication (Mark 12:9; 16:6). It is also possible that the

citing contemporary sources, sees the vineyard, pit, and tower as metaphors of Zion with the temple and its altar, which, together with Jesus' critique of the religious authorities, also foreshadows the destruction of the temple (33).

²⁶¹ Watts, "Psalms," 34, notes the wordplay between "son" (בן) and "stone" (אבן) in the Hebrew, which is lost in the Greek. See also Klyne Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants* (WUNT 27; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983), 63 and 113-18.

²⁶² The root of this word is used repeatedly throughout Mark's narrative, with a variety of connotations: (a) the crowd's positive reaction to Jesus (Mark 1:27; 5:20); (b) Jesus' wonder at the unbelief of the people (Mark 6:6); (c) the perplexity that Jesus' actions and teachings elicit (Mark 10:24, 32); and (d) curiosity (Mark 15:5, 44). The Hebrew root פלא (from which the LXX translation is derived) is used for actions that are difficult to understand, most often positively referring to the miracles of God (Exod 15:11; Ps 77:15; 78:12; 88:11).

“we” of the latter half of the citation anticipates those who have a positive reaction (rather than one of rejection) to the son (for example, the centurion of Mark 15:39).²⁶³

Ps 118 appears to be a thanksgiving psalm composed in response to a military victory and used as a processional.²⁶⁴ The speaker praises God for listening to him when he called out for his help while being surrounded by enemy nations (Ps 118:5, 10). He acknowledges that God has not handed him over to death (118:18). Thus, he enters into the temple to give thanks for God’s salvation (118:21).

Is the whole of Ps 118 relevant for Mark’s context? Each shares the general plot of the suffering and vindication of God’s “son” (the speaker of Ps 118 can be read as either the nation of Israel or a Davidic king), although the exact nature of the vindication varies from salvation from death (Ps 118), judgment on the murderers of the son (parable), and the resurrection of the son despite his murder (Mark 16:6). In fact, this plot is nothing new to the narrative, as Mark’s implied readers have been increasingly prepared to expect the suffering and vindication of Jesus (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34). However, one need not rely solely on the whole context of Ps 118 to see this theme of suffering and vindication. Mark’s placement of this citation on the heels of Jesus’ parable provides his implied reader with the interpretive matrix for these verses. The association of the son with the stone and the tenants with the builders underscores the fact that this entire plot is contained within the explicit citation as well, bolstering the relevance of the psalm by reiterating these themes.

Moreover, the presence of an additional citation of the psalm in Mark 11:9 increases the likelihood that the psalm is being used contextually in Mark 12. Upon Jesus’ entrance into Jerusalem, the crowd calls out to him, shouting the words of Ps 118:25-26; words which also speak to his identity in relation to God (just as the latter use of Ps 118 in Mark 12:10-11 functions as a statement of Jesus’ identity). Since Mark has previously used the language of Ps 118 to speak of Jesus, his use of a different part of the psalm later in his narrative suggests that the entire context of the psalm is attributable to Jesus.

²⁶³ Marcus, *Way*, 112.

²⁶⁴ Leslie C. Allen, *Psalms 101-150* (WBC 21; Waco: Word Books, 1983), 124; Watts, “Psalms,” 30.

Mark 14:18 (Ps 41:10)

After revealing Judas' plot to betray Jesus to the religious authorities in Mark 14:10-11, Mark turns his attention to Jesus' final Passover meal with his disciples before his death. He recounts the preparations of the meal in Mark 14:12-16, and then follows with an account of the meal itself (14:17-26). In the midst of the meal, Jesus announces that one of them will betray him, and when asked to identify the culprit, Jesus answers vaguely that it is one of the twelve who is currently sharing the meal with him. The readers' inside knowledge of Judas' plans is explicitly confirmed later in the narrative (Mark 14:43-45), but here Mark does not elaborate on the identity of the betrayer. Instead, Jesus warns of the judgment that he will incur for betraying the son of man (Mark 14:21). Immediately following his prediction, Jesus shares the bread and the wine with his disciples, an act that has become known as the Lord's Supper.

Jesus' prediction of his betrayal in Mark 14:18 has long been thought to be an allusion to Ps 41:10: "For even the man of my peace, in whom I hoped/trusted, the one who eats my bread, raises his heel against me" (*shared vocabulary*, ὁ ἐσθίων).²⁶⁵ Ps 41, like Ps 22, belongs to the group that is sometimes designated as "the Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer."²⁶⁶ It consists of those psalms that are spoken from the perspective of an individual who laments the persecution he experiences at the hands of his enemies and cries out to God for protection, usually resulting in God's salvation from death. Specifically, Ps 41 is spoken by an individual who laments the deception that surrounds him, deception that comes from both his enemies (Ps 41:6-8) and even his closest friend (Ps 41:10). The psalmist requests that God deliver him so that he can repay those who have set themselves against him (Ps 41:11). It begins and ends with the individual's acknowledgment that God protects those whom he loves and praises him for his actions on behalf of the persecuted (Ps 41:2-4, 12-13). This same sufferer praises God for not allowing his enemy to succeed over him and worships him for securing his place before God himself (Ps 41:12-13).

²⁶⁵ The LXX (Ps 40:10) follows the MT so closely that it is impossible to determine which translation Mark was using. NA²⁷ lists this passage as an allusion.

²⁶⁶ Marcus, *Way*, 172, uses this term and notes that it corresponds to H. Gunkel's category of the laments of the individual. Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium: Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27-16, 20* (Vol.2; Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 349, argues that this phrase is taken from Ps 41 and recalls the theme of the Righteous Sufferer found there.

There are several elements in Mark's account of the Passover supper which overlap with motifs found in Ps 41. The most obvious similarity is the relationship between the speaker and his former friend, who partook of a meal hosted by the speaker and yet turned on him as if he were his enemy. In the same way, Judas, as one of the twelve, was not only eating what the host Jesus had provided at this Passover meal, but had repeatedly partaken of the bread he provided, even that produced by miraculous means (Mark 6:30-44; 8:1-10).²⁶⁷ Even more poignant and ironic, it is in the context of *this* meal, the observation of which Jesus' true "friends" will remember the very death which Judas' betrayal brought about for thousands of years, that Mark underscores the deceit of the former friend who consorts with Jesus' enemies (Ps 41:6-7) while taking advantage of the hospitality of his host. Jesus' following statement of warning concerning the impending judgment that awaits the betrayer may be intentionally reminiscent of the repayment that the psalmist wishes to visit upon his former friend for the wrongs he has committed against him (Ps 41:11). If Mark's allusion encompasses the whole psalm, then the psalmist's declaration that God has placed him in his presence forever (Ps 41:13) can be used to interpret the meaning of Jesus' claim concerning his post-death presence in the kingdom of God (Mark 14:25).

Aside from the shared imagery found in the immediate Markan context of Jesus' last supper, there are other affinities with Ps 41 and Mark's PRN. First, Jesus' enemies are presented as people who are also longing for his death, so much so that they go to great lengths to see it happen (Mark 14:11, 43-50, 55-59; 15:1-4, 11; Ps 41:6-9). Second, his enemies wrongly think that his death will be the end of the matter (Mark 15:29-32; Ps 41:9), yet Jesus rises from the grave, an action Mark repeatedly prepares his readers to expect (ἀναστῆναι, ἀνίστημι: Mark 8:31; 9:10, 31; 10:34; Ps 41:9).

The context of Ps 41, then, infuses the Markan narrative of Jesus' final supper with his disciples, and more specifically his prediction of Judas' betrayal, with a poignancy that would be less acute if only Ps 41:9 was in view. Affinities between the psalmic context and the Markan account include the deception of the speaker by

²⁶⁷ John L. White, "Beware of Leavened Bread: Markan Imagery in the Last Supper," *Forum* 3:4 (1987): 54, sees Jesus' acknowledgment of his betrayer in the context of a meal as reminiscent of his warning concerning the leaven of the Pharisees and Herod in Mark 8:14-21. Mark may be implying that this one within the circle of disciples should be grouped with the Pharisees and Herod!

a close friend, the advantage taken by that former friend in accepting the hospitality of the speaker, the identification of the former friend with the speaker's enemies, the implication of the future judgment that will befall the deceiver, and the expression of hope in the speaker's declaration that he will be in the presence of God (*shared circumstances*). These shared motifs found in the larger context of Ps 41 and Mark's account of Jesus' last supper, as well as his larger narrative, suggest that the whole of Ps 41 is relevant for the interpretation of Mark 14:17-26 and that Mark has prepared his implied readers to see this larger connection.

Mark 15:36 (Ps 69:22)

The final passage to be examined is located immediately after Jesus' cry from the cross and the bystanders' misunderstanding of his words as a call to Elijah (Mark 15:34-35). In response to his cry, someone runs and grabs a sponge, fills it with vinegar, and offers it to Jesus to drink, perhaps in the hopes that it will prolong his life enough to see if Elijah will answer his call (Mark 15:36).²⁶⁸ It is this passage which appears to be an allusion to Ps 69:22 (LXX 68:22; ὄξος, "sour wine," and ποτίζω, "drink").

Ps 69 is also a Psalm of the Righteous Sufferer. The psalmist laments the persecution he endures by his enemies, which consists of false accusation (Ps 69:5), insults (Ps 69:8-11, 20-21), gossip (Ps 69:12-13), and life-threatening hospitality (Ps 69:22). Not only does the psalmist call upon God to save him, he requests that God punish his enemies for their actions against him (Ps 69:23-29). He concludes the psalm by praising God for his protection of the needy (Ps 69:31-34) and for his future saving act on behalf of Zion and her inhabitants (Ps 69:36-37).

It is to the psalmist's account of his enemies' hospitality that Mark is implicitly drawn in Mark 15:36. Like the psalmist, Jesus is offered vinegar to drink. There is an additional similarity besides the similar vocabulary between Ps 69:22 and Mark 15:36 found in the *shared circumstance* of the protagonists. Throughout Mark's PRN, Jesus, like the psalmist, experiences false accusation (Mark 14:56-59) and insults (14:65; 15:16-20, 29-32), which leads him to call upon God (15:34). The

²⁶⁸ There are other ways to interpret this action, one of which is to view it as an act of mockery rather than curiosity.

ironic language of “seeing” in Mark 15:36 (ἰδόμεν), where all but one of Jesus’ bystanders (the centurion) fails truly to see (i.e. understand) what is happening, may also be an allusion to Ps 69:24, where the psalmist requests that his enemies’ eyes be darkened so that they cannot see.²⁶⁹

Yet there are some key differences between Ps 69 and Mark’s account of Jesus’ crucifixion. The specific settings of the passage and its allusion in Mark are quite dissimilar. It is not clear that the offer of vinegar is done maliciously in Mark, although deception is the enemies’ motivation in the psalm.²⁷⁰ Additionally, the offer comes in the context of an execution, whereas Ps 69:22 clearly takes place in the context of a meal. Another important distinction between the two is the absence of any clear imprecatory element in the Markan Jesus’ words or manner of death.²⁷¹ In contrast, the psalmist’s immediate (and lengthy) response to his enemies’ actions in Ps 69:22 is to request that God’s punishment be visited upon them (Ps 69:23-29).

Given these differences, it is uncertain at this point how many of the similarities between Ps 69 and the Markan crucifixion scene can be credited specifically to this psalm. It may be more likely that these similarities can be accounted for by the presence of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer that pervades Mark’s PRN. In this case, Mark may be contrasting the type of Righteous Sufferer that Jesus is, presenting him as one who does not demand revenge for his unjust persecution, i.e. an even *more* righteous man than those presented in the psalms. His implied readers’ prior knowledge of the psalm would also contribute to the Markan irony here, since they would be expecting a request for vengeance that never comes from the lips of Jesus.²⁷²

²⁶⁹ Marcus, *Way*, 183-84, although this would be quite a subtle allusion to this verse, since, (a) the linking verb “to see” is probably not sufficiently distinctive to call attention to the parallel; and (b) Mark uses ὁράω while the LXX uses βλέπω.

²⁷⁰ This deception is clearly apparent from the entire verse, which speaks of the psalmist being poisoned, as well as in the verse immediately following, which contains a request for retribution by means of their own table becoming a “trap” (παγίδα) for them.

²⁷¹ Although some might see in the rending of the veil (Mark 15:38) a foreshadowing of the destruction of the temple. E. g., Incigneri, *Romans*, 202-207.

²⁷² Jesus does implicitly prophesy the destruction of his enemies in Mark 12:9, but I would argue for a distinction between *prophecy* about the destruction that will happen in the future and a *revengeful request* for that destruction like those found in the imprecatory psalms.

Analysis of Results

Often Mark's citations of and allusions to the scriptures appeal to the larger context, and it is possible to determine when they do by observing their function in the overall narrative.

5:1-20: In the story of the Jesus' healing of the Gerasene demoniac, Mark includes elements throughout which indicate that the Exodus account (Exod 14:21-15:21) forms a crucial allusive background, despite the lack of distinctive shared vocabulary. Parallels are found in the settings of the stories (near a "sea" in foreign/Gentile territory), the actions and functions of the characters (Jesus orchestrates the demise of the "military" of pigs; like the Israelites, the demoniac is also in bondage), and the overall plots of both accounts (Like the Israelites, the demoniac is freed from bondage by Jesus, who has God-like power). This passage contains an allusion to an entire event in the scriptures, rather than to one specific passage.

5:22-24, 35-45: Mark's account of the healing of Jairus' daughter contains allusions to two stories in scripture: Elijah's healing of the Zarephath widow's son (1 Kgs 17:17-24) and Elisha's healing of the Shunammite woman's son (2 Kgs 4:32-37). Shared elements include the settings (the healing of an apparently dead child), the actions of the characters (the request of the parent, the prophet's healing taking place in relative seclusion), and the outcome (the healing/raising of the child by the prophet). The implied readers' recognition of these allusions would have been aided by Mark's prior presentation of John and Jesus as Elijah/Elisha figures.

8:17, 18: Jesus' frustration at his disciples' lack of understanding is expressed in an allusion to the hard-heartedness of Pharaoh portrayed in the Exodus account (Exod 4:21; 7:3; 14:4, 17 [Ps 95:8; Isa 63:17]) and a citation from Jer 5:21. The settings of the prominent events in Mark 4-8 (the calming of the storm, Jesus' walking on water, and the feeding miracles) and the characterization of Jesus which they provide intersect with the themes of perception, understanding, hardened hearts, and power over the sea that pervade the Markan context, the larger context of Jer 5:21, and the scriptures which refer to the Exodus account. These shared themes are found beyond the actual citation of the Jeremiah passage, and the reference to the hardening of hearts would have indubitably brought to the mind of the implied reader the course of events which were set in motion by Pharaoh's refusal to acknowledge God's revelation as recounted in Exodus. Thus, by appealing to these larger contexts of

scripture, Mark provides his reader with the interpretive matrix from which he/she should understand the failure of the disciples to grasp the meaning of Jesus' miracles and teachings.

11:17: Perhaps the clearest example of a Markan citation from scripture that has in view a larger context is the combination of Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11 found in the account of Jesus' temple act. Evidence presented in support of this includes the similar roles/characterization of the abusers of the temple in Jer 7 and the temple authorities in Mark, the anti-political and anti-nationalistic concerns of the two passages and their connection with the term *ληστής* found in Mark and Jer 7, and the shared message of judgment indicated in Mark by the condemnatory act of Jesus directed at the temple authorities.

12:1-12 (Isa 5): The presence of similarities in both plot and emphases in the parable of the tenants in Mark 12:1-9 and the song of the vineyard in Isa 5:1-7 suggests that the allusion goes beyond the shared language of Mark 12:1 and Isa 5:1, 2. These similarities include the presentation of God as the owner of both vineyards, the function of the parable and the song to trap the audience within the narrative into a false sense of superiority and security before abruptly undermining their self-importance, and the emphasis on the judgment of those who are unjust.

12:1-12 (Ps 118:22-23): The fact that the entire plot of the previous parable of the tenants in Mark 12:1-9 is summarized in the citation of Ps 118:22-23 suggests that the larger context of the psalm is accentuated, and that both the parable and the psalmic citation are mutually interpretive. The additional presence of a citation from Ps 118:25-26 in the preceding chapter of Mark's narrative would also serve to draw attention to the larger context of the psalm.

14:18: Several motifs found in the larger context of Ps 41 overlap with motifs present in the Markan narrative of the last supper. First, Jesus predicts that he will be betrayed by a trusted friend, just as the Righteous Sufferer of the psalm was betrayed by one close to him. Second, this betrayal will come to the fore in the context of a meal, and furthermore, the betrayer of both passages has taken advantage of his host's hospitality while plotting his death. Third, Jesus also speaks of his betrayer's future judgment for his deception. Fourth, both the psalmist and Jesus declare that they will be in the presence of God. In addition to Jesus' sharing in these specific circumstances with the speaker of the psalm, Mark's allusion to the larger context of Ps 41 would have aided him in his presentation of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer who

will share the same circumstances as that of other previous Righteous Sufferers: persecution to the point of or resulting in death, followed by vindication by God.

At other times Mark includes a scriptural citation or allusion to fit an entirely new context in his narrative on the basis of shared vocabulary, with no clear reference to or affinities with the larger original material. In these cases, the argument that the larger context of the scriptural citation or allusion should influence the meaning of the passage is on shakier ground.

1:2-3: The conflated citation of Mal 3:1, Exod 23:20, and Isa 40:3 at the beginning of the gospel presents many difficulties, not the least of which is the question of scriptural context. The attribution of the entire citation to Isaiah begs the question of which larger context is in view, if any. It seems rather arbitrary to allow the larger context of the Isaianic text to inform the narrative, while disallowing the contexts of the others. On the other hand, the contexts of all three scriptures are concerned with quite different issues. The relative absence of any narrative context preceding the citation limits the primary indicator of how Mark is using the scripture which has been employed in our examination of the other passages in this chapter. These factors make it difficult to determine how Mark is using the citations here.

15:36: The shared vocabulary of ὄξος and ποτίζω between Ps 69:22 and Mk 15:36 appears to be the only significant connecting point between the two passages, as the specific plot of each is quite distinct. Despite the fact that the former also belongs to the category of the Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer, the significant touch-points with that motif are provided in Mark by the allusions and citation of Ps 22. Nothing outside of Ps 69:22 significantly corresponds with the narrative of Jesus' crucifixion, and thus adds nothing to the readers' understanding of Jesus' death.

Conclusions

Unfortunately, the enterprise of determining the boundaries of scriptural allusions and citations is a subjective one, a fact that may have become obvious throughout this chapter. Subsequently, although not all have agreed or will agree with the individual conclusions reached above, the result of this exercise substantiates the claim that *Mark does not always cite or allude to a scriptural text in an atomistic manner, but also cites and alludes to scripture contextually.*

As we have seen above, the clearest indicator for determining which method Mark employs at any given point is his *narrative* context. Shared circumstances and vocabulary placed in the surrounding narrative context of the citation or allusion would have guided Mark's implied reader (i.e. one who had some familiarity with the scriptures and the imagery contained within) to read the passage in light of the surrounding scriptural material.²⁷³ These continuities and/or additional allusions to other sections of the passage of scripture are tangible indicators that the larger context is indeed in view.

These observations concerning the importance of Mark's narrative context for determining his use of the scriptures lead to a more specific question regarding his use of Ps 22. Are there any indications in the gospel narrative leading up to the crucifixion scene, and specifically Mark 15:34, that Mark has in mind the broader "plot" of Ps 22, i.e. the suffering and vindication of God's righteous one?²⁷⁴ How has he prepared his implied reader to anticipate something beyond the suffering that appears on the surface of Jesus' cry "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" Is there a discernable thread of the motif of Righteous Sufferer throughout Mark's gospel? It is to these questions that we now turn.

²⁷³ Watts, *New Exodus*, 312, notes that the frequency of Mark's appeal to the scriptures suggests that his readers were indeed familiar with scriptural imagery.

²⁷⁴ The specific allusions to Ps 22 in Mark will be dealt with extensively in Chapter 7.

Chapter 5

The Socio-Cultural Context of Mark's Gospel: The Motif of the Righteous Sufferer and the Use of Psalms in the First Century

In the previous two chapters I have focused my attention on intratextual issues, i.e., issues that arise from within the text of Mark's gospel. It has been shown that, contrary to the arguments of much of Markan scholarship, Mark has indeed structured his narrative in such a way as to indicate his concern to present Jesus as one who will not only suffer, but will be resurrected and vindicated as well. It has also been shown that Mark's use of the scriptures is often best regarded as contextual rather than atomistic. I have argued that both of these issues provide independent support for understanding Jesus' cry from the cross in Mark 15:34 as a contextual citation of Ps 22:2, one which his implied readers would have recognized and interpreted accordingly. In Chapters 6 and 7, I will increasingly narrow my focus, first investigating such issues as whether the Markan Jesus is presented as a Righteous Sufferer in Mark's wider narrative and then in his PRN, and then dealing specifically with his use of Ps 22 as an intertext in his PRN and particularly in Mark 15:34. In the present chapter, however, I will step outside of the gospel of Mark and touch on some of the extratextual issues which have relevance for the main argument of my study. An understanding of such relevant issues as, (1) the presence of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer in Jewish literature; and (2) the liturgical practices and textual readings of the psalms in general, and Ps 22 in particular, in Mark's socio-cultural context (first century C.E.), may lend support for my overall argument for regarding Mark's use of Ps 22 as contextual. This chapter fits in with my overall strategy of presenting independent strands of evidence which support my thesis. In this case, the strands of evidence discussed in this chapter are held together by the fact that they are issues which are raised outside of the text of Mark; issues which are related to the world in which Mark and his implied readers lived.

First, we will look at the issue of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer, considering whether it is a legitimate category, and whether first-century readers would have recognized this as a motif in the first place, and then examining the textual support for the presence of this motif at the time of Mark's gospel. Second, I will discuss various issues concerning how first-century readers would have read texts such as the psalmic citation in Mark 15:34: Were there such things as incipits?

How were psalms used liturgically? How was Ps 22 appropriated in contemporary texts?

An important distinction must be made before exploring these issues in detail. By discussing these extratextual issues which I believe to be useful in contributing to a more thorough understanding of Mark 15:34, especially as it would have been understood by Mark's implied readers, I am not suggesting that either Mark or his readers would have been directly aware of these other contemporary uses of the Righteous Sufferer motif, the psalms, and Ps 22 in particular. In other words, I am not implying a direct relationship between the Qumran community's use of Ps 22, for instance, and Mark's own use of the psalm. The aim of this chapter is to highlight the fact that these issues were "in the air" during the time of Mark's gospel and were part of his milieu. This creates a strong possibility that Mark and his implied readers would have also used and regarded both the motif of the Righteous Sufferer and the psalms in the same, or similar, way, whether or not they were directly aware of other communities doing the same thing. Thus, we are dealing with possibilities here, attempting to recreate the socio-cultural context of Mark's gospel, rather than implying a direct relationship and/or dependency of one group upon another.

A. Is There a Motif of the Righteous Sufferer?

Although still in the minority, there are some NT scholars who have contested the widely-held view that there existed a cohesive tradition of the Righteous Sufferer in the scriptures and in extra-canonical literature which would have been recognized and/or appropriated by early Christians. In other words, they challenge the thought that there was a body of texts which would have been identified by ancient readers as forming a distinct category driven by the motif of a righteous person who endures persecution.²⁷⁵ Therefore, it is argued, it cannot be

²⁷⁵ For example, cf. Stephen Ahearne-Kroll, "The Suffering of David and the Suffering of Jesus: The Use of Four Psalms of Individual Lament in the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of Mark" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2005). Ahearne-Kroll interacts specifically with Lothar Ruppert's work on the Righteous Sufferer traditions in the scriptures and extra-canonical literature, which we will discuss more thoroughly below.

It must be noted that I do not regard the term "Righteous Sufferer" as an emic category (i. e., that ancient readers would have used this terminology), but rather as an etic category (i. e., that we, as modern readers, use this term to describe a motif which would have been recognizable by the ancients).

assumed that Mark's implied readers would have recognized this as a distinct category or motif in which to understand the identity of Jesus.

D. Juel's comments concerning this issue are representative of the minority opinion. He chastises C. H. Dodd for believing that the Righteous Sufferer psalms and Isa 53 provided a plot for understanding a typical Righteous Sufferer, stating that,

. . . if there is no evidence of such unified interpretation, however, it is difficult to rule out the possibility that Christians made use of bits of pieces of psalms or Isaiah 53 until finally a unified interpretation was produced. . . If there existed no mythic construct such as an apocalyptic Son of man or a Suffering Servant or a Righteous Sufferer, but only the scriptural potential for the construction of these figures, what appear to us as coherent interpretative traditions may well be the product of our imaginations."²⁷⁶

M. Hoffman is also hesitant to attribute the gospels' presentation of Jesus to a Righteous Sufferer tradition, and, more specifically, argues that Ps 22 would not have been considered as belonging to a Righteous Sufferer motif even if it (the motif) had existed.²⁷⁷ However, it is important to recognize that both Juel and Hoffman are approaching this issue from a historical and reconstructive standpoint. Their primary aim is to understand *why* the gospels used Ps 22 to speak of Jesus' identity. Thus, their attempt is to get behind the motivation for the early Christians' linking of the story of Jesus' passion with certain scriptural texts. Their approach contrasts very differently from the approach of this study. Rather than primarily asking *why* Mark used Ps 22 in his account of Jesus' death, our purpose is to examine *how* he does so. Therefore, if it can be shown that there was indeed a body of literature that would have been recognized by his implied readers as belonging to a motif of the Righteous Sufferer, and that Mark's presentation of Jesus is consistent

²⁷⁶ Juel, *Exegesis*, 22; in response to Dodd, *According*, 88-103. It is important to recognize how this smaller argument fits in with his larger critique of Dodd, et al. Juel wants to combat the belief that there was a messianic tradition before Jesus in the scriptural passages used by Christian writers which were deemed appropriate to Jesus, and therefore resulted in him being called "Christ." Instead, he argues that the passages in the scriptures are appropriate to Jesus *because* he was confessed as Messiah.

²⁷⁷ Hoffman, "Psalm 22 (LXX 21)," 23-26. His specific arguments against reading Ps 22 as a Righteous Sufferer psalm (which are also shared by Ahearne-Kroll) will be addressed in the following chapter.

with and makes use of this motif, then it can be argued that it is legitimate to speak of Jesus as the Markan Righteous Sufferer.

The underlying question of this debate can be summarized in this way: What elements of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer need to exist in order for it to be designated as a cohesive tradition? How “solid” does a stereotype/figure have to be before it can be recognized as a motif or typology? In the following two sections of the chapter, we will discuss the possible elements of a Righteous Sufferer tradition in the scriptures and extra-canonical writings, including documents from the Qumran community, in order to determine whether there was indeed a cohesive tradition of the Righteous Sufferer. After laying the groundwork by providing a succinct overview of M. Fishbane’s work on “typology” in the writings of ancient Israel, we will trace the arguments of such scholars as L. Ruppert and G. Nickelsburg, who have done significant work in locating a tradition of the Righteous Sufferer through the scriptures and extra-canonical writings.²⁷⁸ In this way it will be shown that the Righteous Sufferer would have been a recognizable motif to those who read these texts. This will be corroborated by an examination of the portrayal of the “Teacher of Righteousness” of Qumran as a Righteous Sufferer figure, which provides an example of the type of appropriation of the model that Mark himself uses in presenting his Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer. The aim of this work will be to show that the motif of the Righteous Sufferer was “in the air” during the first century C.E., and thus would have been recognized as such by Mark’s early readers.

The Righteous Sufferer in the Scriptures and Extra-Canonical Literature

Fishbane’s volume on biblical interpretation in the scriptures of Israel is the seminal work on the subject.²⁷⁹ For our purposes, it is his discussion of the presence and influence of typologies on later biblical writings which has significance for the present issue. A typology, according to Fishbane, “sees in persons, events, or places the prototype, pattern, or figure of historical persons, events, or places that follow it in time. . . .”²⁸⁰ The latter typology is based on the prototype, highlighting its

²⁷⁸ Others who hold similar views include: Eduard Schweizer, *Lordship and Discipleship* (SBT 28; London: SCM Press, 1960); and Bayer, *Predictions*, 17-19, 239-42. Bayer addresses this motif in his more focused discussion of the passion-resurrection predictions in the gospels.

²⁷⁹ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*.

²⁸⁰ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 350.

continuity with it, while also maintaining distinctions due to its new place in a later historical context.²⁸¹ Thus, a figure that is located within a certain typology would not be expected to be identical to that of the prototype or to those other figures which also share in the typology. This distinction leaves room for creativity on the part of the author, who is not limited to presenting a mere repetition of the prototype, but is allowed to have more flexibility in his own typological presentation.²⁸² Fishbane also underscores both the literary and theological impact of an author's use of typology:

Typologies serve, therefore, as the means whereby the deeper dimensions perceived to be latent in historical events are rendered manifest and explicit to the cultural imagination. For this reason, the fact that a particular event is not rendered solely in its own terms, but is rather reimagined in terms of another—a prototype—is not due to its paucity of religious significance but rather to its abundance.”²⁸³

Fishbane's work has obvious ramifications for our search for a cohesive tradition of the Righteous Sufferer in the scriptures and in extra-canonical literature. He has shown that within the scriptures, writers often adopted and adapted typologies in order to highlight both continuity and discontinuity between later figures in Israel's history and those who came before them. As we have seen in Chapter 4 of this study, Mark's gospel makes great use of the scriptures in presenting his narrative of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection. It may even be argued, as I have done in that chapter, that one way Mark uses the scriptures is to present Jesus as a typology of a major figure in those texts.²⁸⁴ Is it not highly possible, then, that Mark has made use of other typologies in his presentation of Jesus, one of which could include the figure of the Righteous Sufferer?²⁸⁵ Let us examine whether there exists in the scriptures and

²⁸¹ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 352.

²⁸² The significance of this point will be demonstrated in the following chapter which deals with Mark's presentation of Jesus as his Righteous Sufferer in his narrative.

²⁸³ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 360.

²⁸⁴ See, for example, Mark 5:22-24, 35-45, where Jesus is presented as one who heals like Elijah (1 Kgs 17:17-24) and Elisha (2 Kgs 4:32-37).

²⁸⁵ Hoffman, "Psalm 22 (LXX 21)," 24-25, has misgivings about referring to the speaker of Ps 22 as a typology of the Righteous Sufferer with reference to Jesus due to its use to describe God's saving of the author of 2 Timothy from harm (2 Tim 4:17-18; Ps 22:22). His contention that Ps 22 (which, according to him, was a difficult psalm for the gospel writers to use) was only used because

extra-canonical literature a tangible Righteous Sufferer figure from which Mark could have drawn for his presentation of Jesus.

Ruppert investigates the tradition of the Righteous Sufferer (*der leidende Gerechte*) in the psalms, Isaiah, and extra-canonical literature.²⁸⁶ After surveying the various places where this theme is present,²⁸⁷ he attempts a synthesis of this material. He locates what he refers to as the “three different lines of development of the motif” (*Drei verschiedenen Entwicklungslinien des Motivs*) in the writings of Israel. In the “Wisdom” line of development, texts such as Ps 34 and 37 are representatives of this line’s fullest development in their combination of the educational, trial, and leadership theology of the Righteous Sufferer.²⁸⁸ The prime example of the second line, which Ruppert describes as “Eschatological,” can be found in the presentation of the “Teacher of Righteousness,” in the Qumran literature. This is especially apparent in 1QH X-XVI, which adopts the language of the Psalms of the Lament to speak of this enigmatic figure.²⁸⁹ The latest and most developed of the three lines is the “Apocalyptic,” which represents the final stage in the motif of the Righteous Sufferer. These texts adopt the motif of the “Suffering Servant” of the “Servant Songs” of Isaiah (Isa 52-53) and value the martyrdom of the Righteous Sufferer as a

there was something specific about it that applied directly to Jesus’ passion, leads him to dispute the possibility that Ps 22 provided a “general” typology for their portrayal of Jesus. This is related to his overall aim to discover *why* early Christians appropriated Ps 22 to Jesus. However, *contra* Hoffman, I would argue that the Righteous Sufferer typology does not have to be exclusively appropriated for Jesus in order for it to be present in Mark’s narrative. An understanding of *how* Mark is appropriating this psalm to present Jesus’ death and resurrection (rather than *why* he does so) does not require one to rule out the possibility that the gospel writers were indeed adopting a more general typology of the Righteous Sufferer (shared by others such as the author of 2 Tim), while making it clear throughout their narratives that *this* Righteous Sufferer is unique.

²⁸⁶ Lothar Ruppert, *Der leidende Gerechte: Eine motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Alten Testament und zwischentestamentlichen Judentum* (FzB 5; Würzburg, 1972); and *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte? Der Weg Jesu im Lichte eines alt- und zwischentestamentlichen Motivs* (Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1972). Ruppert summarizes the main arguments of his first volume in *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?* and applies his findings to the gospels’ use of this tradition in their presentations of Jesus’ passion. It is this second volume which is more relevant for our purposes and thus will be our primary focus.

²⁸⁷ For example, Ps 18; 22; 34; 37; 140; 141; Isa 52-53; Sus; 1QH VII, X-XVI; Wis 2, 5; 4 Macc; 1 En; Gk. Apoc. Ezra; and 2 Bar. With regard to 1QH, Puech’s numbering system is used in this study, which is based on his thesis that most of the first three columns of the *Hodayot* scroll are lost: Émile Puech, “Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes,” *JJS* 39 (1988): 38-55.

²⁸⁸ Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*, 26-27.

²⁸⁹ Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*, 27.

collective representative of God's suffering people.²⁹⁰ Unlike that of Nickelsburg (below), Ruppert's study incorporates texts that belong to a variety of literary genres (for example, he includes the psalms²⁹¹). These texts span hundreds of years collectively, involve many different historical events, and recast the common motif of the persecution of God's righteous one(s) in a myriad of circumstances.²⁹²

Nickelsburg has also done extensive work on the motif of the Righteous Sufferer in Jewish literature. In his published dissertation, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*, he traces the "story of the persecution and exaltation and/or vindication of the righteous man" throughout the scriptures and extra-canonical literature, from Genesis to the Maccabees.²⁹³ The ultimate example of this motif, according to Nickelsburg, is the story of the persecuted righteous man in Wis 2:12-20 and 4:18c-5:14. The bulk of his work in this study examines the

²⁹⁰ Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*, 27-28. Ruppert even goes so far as to describe the motif at this stage of development as a "dogma"! Although this may be somewhat exaggerated, it is clear from texts such as 4 Macc that the issue of the persecution and suffering of the righteous was a powerful and community-shaping motif at this time. Cf. Israel Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. D. Maisel; Berkley: University of California Press, 2000), who puts forward the provocative (but ultimately unsubstantiated) theory that another "suffering servant" figure in the Qumran scrolls is the "Qumran Messiah" and the precursor to Jesus' portrayal as Messiah.

²⁹¹ Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*, 17-18, 20-21, also discusses the role of the speakers of the Psalms of Lament as Righteous Sufferer figures.

²⁹² Ahearne-Kroll, "Suffering of David," 21, critiques Ruppert for ignoring the complexities that are involved in dealing with material that represents such a wide range of genre, time, and historical circumstances. He sees Ruppert's enterprise as one that fails to acknowledge the discontinuity between these texts, labeling it as "simplistic." Perhaps Nickelsburg's approach (discussed below) would be more amenable to Ahearne-Kroll, since he highlights both continuity and discontinuity between texts, and limits his discussion to narrative texts only (Ahearne-Kroll does not reference Nickelsburg's volume). Ahearne-Kroll's plea for caution in tracing a strict development-line (as if the latter texts fundamentally *depended on* the former in a foundational sense) through this wide body of literature is both legitimate and helpful. However, given the evidence of this shared motif (Righteous Sufferer) in this variety of texts, one should not accentuate the discontinuity over the continuity, but rather should hold these in tension, recognizing the ability of writers to adopt *and* adapt a motif to suite the needs of their audience and their overall purposes in general. I, like Ahearne-Kroll, also have reservations concerning Ruppert's labeling of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer as a "dogma" by the time of Jesus, although *contra* Ahearne-Kroll, I regard the evidence presented by both Ruppert and Nickelsburg as, (a) sufficient enough to hold these texts together as a distinctive body of literature despite their generic distinctions; and (b) adequate support for the presence of a relatively cohesive tradition of the Righteous Sufferer by the first century.

²⁹³ George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972). He finds this "story" in Gen 37; *Ahiqar*; Esth; Dan 3 and 6; Sus; Wis 2, 4-5; 2 Macc 7; and 3 Macc. He limits his discussion to *narrative* texts which contain this *Gattung*, thus excluding any psalms which share many of the same elements.

parallels between this text and others which contain the Righteous Sufferer motif.²⁹⁴ In the process, he determines that these texts belong to a single *Gattung*, and he provides a list of the shared narrative elements found within each story (and in Wis) that belong to this motif of the Righteous Sufferer. These elements include: reason,²⁹⁵ conspiracy,²⁹⁶ accusation,²⁹⁷ trial,²⁹⁸ reactions,²⁹⁹ choice,³⁰⁰ ordeal,³⁰¹ help,³⁰² condemnation,³⁰³ protest,³⁰⁴ trust,³⁰⁵ rescue,³⁰⁶ exaltation,³⁰⁷ investiture,³⁰⁸ proclamation,³⁰⁹ acclamation,³¹⁰ reaction,³¹¹ vindication,³¹² confession,³¹³ and punishment of the enemy.³¹⁴ Within Nickelsburg's schema, most of these elements are found in all the stories surveyed, although not always in the same order. Although Nickelsburg's main goal is to understand the function of the element of exaltation and vindication in these stories, his careful tracing of the other narrative

²⁹⁴ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 48-111. Nickelsburg divides this section into two chapters, the first dealing with the "story of the persecution and exaltation of the righteous man" (48-92), and then the second, "the story of the persecution and vindication of the righteous (93-111)" although he does not appear to regard the terms "exaltation" and "vindication" as mutually exclusive.

²⁹⁵ Gen 37; *Ahiqar*; Esth; Dan 6; Sus; 3 Macc.

²⁹⁶ Gen 37; *Ahiqar*; Esth; Dan 6; Sus; 3 Macc.

²⁹⁷ *Ahiqar*; Esth; Dan 3 and 6; Sus; 3 Macc.

²⁹⁸ *Ahiqar*; Dan 3; Sus; 2 Macc 7.

²⁹⁹ *Ahiqar*; Dan 6; 2 Macc 7; 3 Macc.

³⁰⁰ Dan 3 and 6; Sus; 2 Macc 7; 3 Macc.

³⁰¹ Gen 37; Dan 3 and 6.

³⁰² Gen 37; *Ahiqar*; Esth; Dan 6; Sus; 2 Macc 7; 3 Macc.

³⁰³ Gen 37; *Ahiqar*; Esth; Dan 3 and 6; Sus; 2 Macc 7; 3 Macc.

³⁰⁴ *Ahiqar*; Sus; 3 Macc.

³⁰⁵ Sus; 2 Macc 7; 3 Macc.

³⁰⁶ Gen 37; *Ahiqar*; Esth; Dan 3 and 6; Sus; 2 Macc 7; 3 Macc.

³⁰⁷ Gen 37; *Ahiqar*; Esth; Dan 3 and 6; Sus; 3 Macc.

³⁰⁸ Gen 37; *Ahiqar*; Esth; 3 Macc.

³⁰⁹ *Ahiqar*; 3 Macc.

³¹⁰ Gen 37; Esth; Dan 3 and 6; Sus; 2 Macc 7; 3 Macc.

³¹¹ Esth; Dan 3 and 6; 3 Macc.

³¹² Dan 3 and 6; Sus; 2 Macc 7; 3 Macc.

³¹³ Gen 37.

³¹⁴ *Ahiqar*; Esth; Dan 3 and 6; Sus; 2 Macc 7; 3 Macc. The elements of this motif of the Righteous Sufferer which can be located in Mark's narrative and refer to Jesus will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

elements in the motif of the Righteous Sufferer is also helpful for our purposes. His work highlights the existence of a group of stories in the scriptures and extra-canonical literature which contain a protagonist who experiences suffering at the hands of his/her enemies, but who is rescued or has the promise of rescue by God due to his/her innocence. The presence of several stories which contain overlapping scenarios for their protagonists in these texts suggests that one can indeed speak of a “motif of the Righteous Sufferer” that was in existence well before the first century C.E.³¹⁵ In addition, the fact that these stories *center* around a character (or characters) who embodies “righteousness” or innocence in contrast to those around him/her indicates that it is the identification of this person as a Righteous Sufferer that is a key—and perhaps *the* key—aspect of each narrative. In other words, the presence of shared narrative elements in these texts that seemingly overlap by random (i.e., elements that do not appear to be functioning in relation to one another except by proximity) would not be sufficient to indicate that they belong to the same motif. It is both the content of these elements and the similarity in their function to present the main character as a righteous person who suffers unjustly at the hands of his enemies which indicate their being part of the same *Gattung* of the Righteous Sufferer.

The Righteous Sufferer at Qumran

The figure of “the Teacher of Righteousness” (מורה הצדק) at Qumran has been a matter of great interest to scholars who study the remnants of the community’s documents, as well as its socio-cultural overlap with and distinction from its historical setting.³¹⁶ This Teacher of Righteousness is presented as a faithful follower of God (and the founder of the community³¹⁷) who is persecuted unjustly by

³¹⁵ Bayer, *Predictions*, 241, also believes that the analogies between Mark 8:31 and Ps 33:20 is another indication that the motif of the Righteous Sufferer was present at this time.

³¹⁶ The attempt to determine whether or not מורה הצדק refers to a historical person, and if so, his identity, is not a concern of this study. Cf. Ben Zion Wacholder, “The Righteous Teacher in the Pesharite Commentaries,” *HUCA* 73 (2002): 1-27, for the view that מורה הצדק in the pesharim did not refer to a historical person, but rather to a future personality (along with הרשע הכוהן). Cf. James C. G. Greig, “The Teacher of Righteousness and the Qumran Community,” *NTS* 2 (1955): 119-26; and Håkan Ulfgard, “The Teacher of Righteousness, the History of the Qumran Community, and Our Understanding of the Jesus Movement: Texts, Theories and Trajectories,” in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (eds. F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson; JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 310-46, for examples of the attempts to identify מורה הצדק and הכוהן הרשע with historical figures.

³¹⁷ 4QpPs^a III, 15-16.

“the Wicked Priest” (הכוהן הרשע).³¹⁸ Although מורה הצדק has often been understood as an objective genitive³¹⁹—referring to the *content* of the figure’s teaching, i.e., “righteousness”—I agree with others that there is stronger evidence for taking it as a subjective genitive.³²⁰ In that case, הצדק functions as an adjectival attribute of the Teacher—he is a righteous person. There are two pieces of evidence which are most convincing. First, the contrast between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest, where the former is portrayed as the counterpart to the latter suggests that צדק may be used similarly as a qualifier for the Teacher, just as רשע is used as a qualifier for the Priest.³²¹ Second, based on Ps 37:32-33, 4QpPs^a IV,8 refers to the Teacher as “the righteous one” (הצדיק).³²² Thus, although the Teacher of Righteousness might also have been regarded as one who taught “righteousness” in the community, it is the use of the term as a descriptor of the figure’s character which is most significant.³²³ The adjectival use of צדק in these texts is reminiscent of the literature examined in the previous section, which presents persons whose righteousness is made most evident precisely in the midst of their suffering.

Two aspects of the presentation of the Teacher of Righteousness in the documents of the Qumran community have direct relevance for this study. First, particularly with regard to the conflict between himself and the Wicked Priest, the Teacher of Righteousness shares with the other Righteous Sufferers of Jewish

³¹⁸ The vast majority of references to the Teacher of Righteousness are found in one copy of the Psalms Peshier found in cave 4 (4QpPs^a) and the Habakkuk Peshier found in cave 1 (1QpHab). These peshier documents are considered to be relatively later than others of the Qumran corpus (Herodian), making them roughly contemporary to that of Mark; cf. Ulfsgard, “The Teacher of Righteousness,” 326-27.

³¹⁹ For example, see Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 308-318.

³²⁰ See Samuel Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism, and the Matthean Community* (ConBNT 24; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1994), 119, for a more lengthy discussion of the evidence.

³²¹ See especially 1QpHab IX,9-10 and XI,4-5. Note, however, that there is some debate as to whether the “Wicked Priest” of 4QpPs^a and “the Liar” of 1QpHab are one and the same person. See Timothy H. Lim, “The Wicked Priest or the Liar?,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim; Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd, 2000), 45-51.

³²² This reconstruction of the lacuna in 4QpPs^a IV,8 is derived from the citation in 4QpPs^a IV,7: “The wicked watches out for *the righteous one* (לצדיק) and seeks [to slay him. The Lord will not abandon him into his hand or] let him be condemned when he is tried.” This translation is adapted from that of Géza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin Books, 1997), 490. Italics mine. All translations of Qumran documents will follow Vermes unless otherwise indicated.

³²³ Byrskog, *Only Teacher*, 119.

literature a similar experience of persecution. This becomes most explicit in the Qumran texts that use two particular psalms as intertexts to speak about the circumstances of the Teacher of Righteousness.³²⁴

I have already mentioned that the conflict between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness is portrayed in 4QpPs^a IV,7-8 using the language of Ps 37. This text is particularly suited for the purposes of the writer of this *peshet*, as his focus is to present the ways of the Wicked Priest as those which are in contrast to actions of the Teacher of Righteousness. This is an adoption of a contrast between those who are wicked and those who are righteous, a contrast that forms the dominant theme of the psalm. Ps 37 speaks of the efforts of the wicked to persecute those who are righteous (37:12, 14, 32), urging the righteous to place their trust in Yahweh who will deliver them (37:3, 40).³²⁵ Like the righteous of Ps 37 and other Righteous Sufferers in Jewish literature—Daniel and Susanna, for example—the Teacher of Righteousness endures the effort of the Wicked Priest to put him on trial to condemn him to death,³²⁶ but has the promise of vindication by God.

Further evidence that the Teacher of Righteousness was regarded as a Righteous Sufferer figure can be found in the *Hodayot*. Both Jeremias and Ruppert argue that several of these hymns of thanksgiving were written by the Teacher himself (or at least written from the perspective of the Teacher).³²⁷ Among these is 1QH XIII, which contains a citation of Ps 41:10:

[All who have ea]ten my bread
have lifted their heel against me,
and all those joined to my Council

³²⁴ See also 4QpPs^a II,16-21; 1QpHab V,8-12; IX,8-12; and XI,3-8, for other passages which mention the persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness.

³²⁵ The psalm not only promises Yahweh's protection, but exhorts the righteous to continue their resistance of evil (Ps 37:27, 34).

³²⁶ Note that TRIAL and CONDEMNATION are two elements of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer. See Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*.

³²⁷ Jeremias, *Der Lehrer*, 171; Ruppert, *Der leidende Gerechte*, 123. Cf. also Philip R. Davies, *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 87-105, who argues that even if the Teacher of Righteousness did not write the *Hodayot*, it is likely that members of the community believed it to be written by him, thus affecting their interpretations. Those hymns attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness (according to Jeremias) are 1QH X,1-19, 31-39; XI,1-18; XII,5-13,4; XIII,5-19; XIII,20-15,5; XV,6-25; XVI,4-40.

have mocked me with wicked lips.³²⁸

A. Collins sees in this citation an indication that the Teacher of Righteousness “re-wrote the psalm with himself as the speaker. . . .”³²⁹ According to Collins, comparisons can be made with the Teacher of Righteousness’ strategy of writing himself into Ps 41 and this same type of phenomenon happening with regard to Ps 22, where David was “written into the text” as the speaker during the exilic period.³³⁰ In a similar manner, just as the Teacher of Righteousness claims the words of a Psalm of Lament as his own, so also does the Markan Jesus appropriate the words of Ps 22 for himself and his own situation. Thus, for all three figures—David, the Teacher of Righteousness, and the Markan Jesus—the words of the psalmist become their own words, the circumstances of the psalmist become their own circumstances. These figures endure persecution from their enemies, and they understand their vindication by God as having eschatological significance.³³¹

Second, as we shall see, the Teacher of Righteousness functions as a prototype of the community, i.e., he is perceived as an exemplar for those who belong to the Qumran community. This parallels the Markan presentation of Jesus as an exemplar for his own community (Mark’s implied readers).

Approaching the question of the function of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran community in terms of social identity, J. Jokiranta has convincingly shown that this figure “represents an ideal community member, who captures some essential characteristics of group’s identity.”³³² She uses the language of “prototype”

³²⁸ Vermes, *Complete*, 269. Italics mine.

³²⁹ Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Appropriation of the Psalms of Individual Lament by Mark,” in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C. M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 223-41 (226). That this is written from the perspective of the Teacher of Righteousness is further substantiated by the previous line’s mention of the “members of *my Covenant*” (1QH XIII,23).

³³⁰ Collins, “Appropriation,” 226. Collins holds that it was during the exile when the title of Ps 22 was added and the psalm was included in “the Davidic collection” of Pss 3-41 (225).

³³¹ Cf. Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*, 22-23, who describes the Teacher of Righteousness’ self-understanding as that of an eschatological Jeremiah. This eschatological dimension is especially clear in 1QH XV,12: “For Thou wilt condemn in Judgement all those who assail me, distinguishing through me between the just and the wicked.” The eschatological significance of the psalmist’s rescue is also apparent in Ps 22:28-32. The clearest examples in Mark of Jesus’ eschatological role after vindication are Mark 13:26-27 and 14:62.

³³² Jutta Jokiranta, “The Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim: A Social Identity Approach,” in *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in Its Social Context* (ed. P. Esler; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 254-63 (255).

from social identity theory and applies it to the Teacher of Righteousness due to his embodiment of the characteristics valued and held by his community. These characteristics distinguish him from those outside of his in-group, and thus drive a wedge between him and those outsiders (such as the Wicked Priest, for example). As a prototype of the Qumran community, then, he functions as one with and in whom the in-group locates its identity.³³³ He is also understood as the leader of the community, which is related to his function as a prototype, because he best fits the group's ideals and has the strongest influence on those within the group.³³⁴

According to Jokiranta, one of the primary indicators of the Teacher of Righteousness' "prototypicality" is the presence of statements which highlight the similarities between him and his community.³³⁵ One of the clearest examples of this can be found in 4QpPs^a II,13-21. Here the Teacher of Righteousness³³⁶ and "the men of his Council" are persecuted by the wicked.³³⁷ This passage not only highlights the function of the Teacher as a prototype of his community, but also presents him (and, by extension, his "Council") as a Righteous Sufferer. In addition, the singular term "righteous" does not refer specifically to the Teacher, but to the community, i.e., those who practice the law.³³⁸ Thus, both the Teacher and his community are presented as righteous ones who endure persecution by the wicked because of their faithfulness to the law.³³⁹

Using Texts in the First Century

This section of the chapter may be described broadly as an examination of how texts (most specifically, the psalms) were being used in the socio-cultural milieu

³³³ Jokiranta, "Prototypical Teacher," 262. Her comments regarding community identity are worth quoting at length here: "In the Psalms and Habakkuk Pesher, the prototypical image of the teacher in conflict makes a statement from the past: all the leaders of the Jerusalem establishment as well as rival authorities were wicked; a distinct community was needed . . . the prototypical picture of the teacher-leader enabled later group members to identify with him and even perceive him as their contemporary (263).

³³⁴ Jokiranta, "Prototypical Teacher," 255-56.

³³⁵ Jokiranta, "Prototypical Teacher," 257.

³³⁶ In 4QpPs^a II,16 the one being persecuted is called "Priest," but it is clear from 4QpPs^a III,15 that the two figures are one and the same person.

³³⁷ 4QpPs^a II,16.

³³⁸ 4QpPs^a II,13-14, 19-20.

³³⁹ Other examples of passages where the Teacher and his community share the same persecutions include 1QpHab IX,8-12 and XI,3-8.

of Mark's gospel. This takes into account both evidence from the worship practices of the first-century Jewish and Christian communities, as well as evidence from the various texts which originated around that time. Thus, this section will touch on a variety of issues. First, since it is the concern of this study to determine whether the first line of Ps 22 cited in Mark 15:34 would have implied the remainder of the psalm, the evidence for the presence of incipits as a literary device before, during, and after the time of Mark's gospel will be considered and weighed. Second, an examination of how the psalms functioned in the worship of the temple, synagogue, and Qumran communities in the first century will be undertaken in the hopes that this will inform our understanding of the liturgical use of the psalms of that period. Third, the use of Ps 22 as an intertext in several (roughly) contemporary texts of Mark's gospel will be observed in order to highlight any parallels between these texts and Mark's use of Ps 22. Only when we understand how these texts were used by the communities that surrounded and influenced Mark and his implied readers can we begin to make informed decisions about how Mark himself might have appropriated Ps 22 in his portrayal of Jesus in his gospel.

Incipits

In Chapter 4 of this study we examined Mark's use of the scriptures throughout his gospel in order to determine whether the larger context of the citations and allusions were meant to illumine its new context. This experiment was limited to only one book of the NT, but the issue reaches far beyond Markan studies. There is much debate among scholars as to whether the practice of citing scriptural passages by writers throughout the NT was done atomistically or contextually. Dodd is probably the scholar most often associated with the latter view, but there are others who are convinced by this position.³⁴⁰ The arguments of those who find much of the intertextual use of the scriptures in the NT contextual would be greatly supported if it could be shown that this was a practice in other Jewish texts. Moreover, an even stronger case could be made for regarding the citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 as

³⁴⁰ Dodd, *According*, 126-27. Cf. also Joachim Jeremias, "παῖς θεοῦ," *TDNT* 5:701; Charles E. B. Cranfield, "A Study of St. Mark 1.9-11," *SJT* 8 (1955): 59-50; Watts, *New Exodus*, 3 and 135; and Marcus, *Way*, 21, 180, and 200. Those who challenge Dodd's thesis include Juel, *Exegesis*, 21-22; and Hatina, *Search*, whose main enterprise is to show that it is the new context which takes interpretive precedence over the original context of a citation.

contextual if it could be shown that psalms were cited or alluded to in this manner in other Jewish texts as well. Evidence for this practice both before, during, and after the writing of the NT will be offered in support of this argument.

It has often been asserted that the first lines of psalms, or “incipits”, sometimes functioned similarly to titles, in that they served to indicate that the remainder of the psalm was implied in the context in which the incipit was located.³⁴¹ There is evidence of this specific use of the psalms both before the first century (in the scriptures), in Second Temple Judaism (Qumran), and afterwards, during the writing of the Mishnah.³⁴² In the scriptures there are also similar examples of this method which involve naming books and objects by the first line or words written or spoken.

In ancient Jewish traditions it was often customary to name a book by the first word(s) of the book. This method is found in the first two books of the Pentateuch. The first word of the book of Genesis is בְּרֵאשִׁית, and this is its title. The book of Exodus begins with the words אֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת, and they too form the title. In Gen 31:49 there is a post named “Mizpah” (הַמִּצְפָּה), “the one who watches.” This is taken from the first word of the last clause in Jacob’s covenant with Laban, where they ask God to watch over their agreement so that they will not cheat on each other.³⁴³

W.F. Albright has provided perhaps the most helpful discussion on the use of incipits in the psalms, more specifically in Ps 68.³⁴⁴ He argues that Ps 68 consists of a list of about thirty incipits of ancient hymns, and therefore that its original function was as a type of catalogue of ancient lyric poems or hymns. He believes this method

³⁴¹ This term was coined by William F. Albright, “A Catalog of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems,” *HUCA* 23 (1950): 1-39. Other terms have been used (for example, “title” by Loren Fisher, “Betrayed By Friends: An Expository Study of Psalm 22,” *Int* 18 [1964]: 20-38; and “motto” Moo, *Old Testament*, 271); however, these do not adequately convey the full function of the citation in our passage of interest.

³⁴² The Mishnah appeared as relatively fixed approximately 200 C.E. See Jacob Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), xi.

³⁴³ Fisher, “Betrayed,” 23. Also R. B. Y. Scott, “The Pillars Jachin and Boaz,” *JBL* 58 (1939): 143-49, argues that the two columns in Solomon’s temple (1 Kgs 7:21) were named by the first words of two oracles, Jachin and Boaz, which stood for “Yahweh will *establish* the throne of David, and his kingdom to his seed forever” and “*In the strength* of Yahweh shall the king rejoice.” For an abbreviated discussion of Scott’s article, see Fisher, “Betrayed,” 23.

³⁴⁴ Albright, “Catalog,” 1-39.

of identifying poetic compositions by citing their first line to be modeled after Sumerian and Akkadian models, and possibly Canaanite.³⁴⁵ Albright notes that there are a number of such citations in the scriptures which resemble the incipits in Ps 68 very closely, the clearest of which is found in Exod 15:21. Here the title to Miriam's song is the incipit of the "Song of Moses" sung immediately before (Exod 15:1).³⁴⁶ Albright's thesis has, however, been met with criticism. J. Gray disagrees with Albright, arguing that, in regarding the sections of Ps 68 as incipits, he ignores the common *Sitz im Leben* in which all thirty passages were written. According to Gray, Ps 68 was written in the specific context of the cultic Autumn Festival.³⁴⁷ Gray's objection and alternate suggestion, however, fails to account sufficiently for the lack of a clear thought pattern that connects the phrases of the psalm. Albright's thesis is the more convincing,³⁴⁸ due to the fact that he does not attempt to force a contrived connection between the lines or discover a theme throughout the psalm, but rather takes the psalm on its own terms. He also provides evidence of contemporary ANE models of this type of catalogue, taking care to locate the psalm in a *Sitz im Leben*, rather than ignoring it altogether. Additionally, his thesis does not exclude the possibility that the elements of Ps 68 were used in cultic contexts,³⁴⁹ and he displays proof that similar incipits were used in the scriptures.³⁵⁰

Was the custom still in practice after this early period? Fortunately, there are two strands of evidence from the Qumran documents which provide roughly contemporary (to Mark) examples of incipit recognition and use. As far as I am aware, these examples have not yet been cited by any NT scholar who argues at any

³⁴⁵ Albright, "Catalog," 7, 8. He also notes that Akkadian epics were recognized by their first few words (for example, *Enuma Elish*), but lyric poems required much longer incipits because they were so numerous. He believes that the Israelite practice was ultimately derived from the Akkadians.

³⁴⁶ Albright, "Catalog," 7. He also lists other examples of this, which include the use of Ps 68:2 repeated as an incipit in Num 10:35, as well as incipits in Num 21:17; 1 Sam 18:7; Isa 23:16. See below for further evidence that Exod 15:21 is indeed an incipit.

³⁴⁷ Cf. John R. Gray, "A Cantata of the Autumn Festival: Psalm LXVIII," *JSS* 22 (1977): 2-26.

³⁴⁸ The lack of discussion of Albright's article among scholars (especially those of the NT) who discuss the phenomena of incipits is perplexing. Other scholars who view Ps 68 in a way that is compatible with Albright's thesis include William O. E. Oesterley, *Psalms Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes* (London: SPCK, 1953), 320; and Hans Schmidt, *Die Psalmen* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1934).

³⁴⁹ *Contra* Gray, "Cantata," 3.

³⁵⁰ See the example given above, Exod 15:1.

length for the use of incipits and/or contextual citations by the NT writers.³⁵¹ Thus, I will introduce new evidence into the discussion, which, given that these texts (Qumran) were written closer to the time of Mark's narrative than the scriptural evidence (above) and the rabbinic evidence (below), provide the clearest indication that this practice was indeed being exercised in the first century.

I have already mentioned the presence of an incipit in the song sung by Miriam in Exod 15:21. The fact that Exod 15:21 is an incipit is corroborated by the presence of at least part of the content of this "Song of Miriam" in the Qumran scroll 4Q365 6a.ii.1-7. This portion of the fragmentary text known as the Reworked Pentateuch^c is the filling out of Miriam's song, which is not present in any other known version of the Pentateuch.³⁵² It is immediately followed by the remaining portion of the narrative, Exod 15:22-26 (it is likely that Exod 15:27 was present at some time, but is now missing due to the fragmentary nature of the text), in 4Q365 6a II, 8-14. Dated by means of palaeography to 75-50 BCE, the presence of the "Song of Miriam" indicates that roughly contemporary (to Mark) interpreters of scripture both recognized and understood the significance of incipits.

An incipit may also be present in 4Q174 (also known as 4QFlorilegium), a first-century B.C.E testimonium, i.e., collection of scriptural citations. 4Q174 1 I, 18-19 is a citation of Ps 2:1, 2, followed by a brief interpretation of the citation. What is interesting to note is that there is a *vacat* after this citation, the first in the text, which may indicate that the larger context of the psalm is in view. It is also possible, however, that the nature of the format of the text (as a testimonium) as well as the content of the text (citations from the middle of scriptural passages³⁵³) should prohibit one from regarding the psalmic citation as an incipit in the purest sense of the word.

There are also several examples of this use of the psalms in the Mishnah, particularly in the context of liturgical worship. *Tamid* 7:4 reads:

³⁵¹ For example, Watts, *New Exodus*, 3 and 135, mentions the practice during the rabbinic period only; and Fisher, "Betrayed," cites evidence from the scriptures and rabbinic literature, skipping over the period of Qumran scribal activity.

³⁵² Sidnie White Crawford, "Miriam," *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* 1:566-67. The fact that there is no other extant version of the song suggests that this was a composition of the Qumran community.

³⁵³ Ps 89:23; 2 Sam 7:10; Exod 15:17-18; 2 Sam 7:11; 2 Sam 7:12-14; Amos 9:11; Isa 8:11; Ezek 44:10.

This was the singing which the levites used to sing in the Temple.

On the first day they sang *The earth is the Lord's and all that therein is, the round world and they that dwell therein*; (Ps 24)

On the second day they sang *Great is the Lord and highly to be praised in the city of our God, even upon his holy hill*; (Ps 48)

On the third day they sang *God standeth in the congregation of God, he is a judge among the gods*; (Ps 82)

On the fourth day they sang *O Lord God to whom vengeance belongeth, thou God to whom vengeance belongeth show thyself*; (Ps 94)

On the fifth day they sang *Sing we merrily unto God our strength, make a cheerful noise unto the God of Jacob*; (Ps 81)

On the sixth day they sang *The Lord is king, and hath put on glorious apparel*; (Ps 93)

On the Sabbath they sang *A Psalm: A Song for the Sabbath Day* (Ps 92) --

A Psalm, a song for the time that is to come, for the day that shall be all Sabbath and rest in the life everlasting.³⁵⁴

In *m. Ta'an.* 2:3, the blessings said in worship include the incipits of several psalms as well as the beginning verse of Jer 14:

And these are they:

the Remembrance and the *Shofar* verses,

and *In my distress I cried unto the Lord and he answered me . . .*, (Ps 120)

and *I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills . . .*, (Ps 121)

and *Out of the deep have I cried unto thee, O Lord . . .*, (Ps 130)

and *A prayer of the afflicted when he is overwhelmed . . .* (Ps 102³⁵⁵).

³⁵⁴ Translation taken from Herbert Danby, *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), 589.

³⁵⁵ In this case, the title of the psalm is regarded as the beginning of the psalm proper.

R. Judah says: He need not recite the Remembrance and *Shofar* verses,
but he recites in their stead the passages,
If there be in the land, famine, if there be pestilence . . ., (1 Kgs 8:37)
and *The word of the Lord that came to Jeremiah concerning the drought . . .*
(Jer 14:1).
And he seals each of them with its proper ending.³⁵⁶

Here we see evidence of a text other than the psalms whose first verse is cited as an indication that the remainder of the passage was prayed as well. That the whole of each psalm was prayed is evident from the closing sentence of the section which speaks of an experienced elder³⁵⁷ concluding each blessing with an ending not provided by the writer of *m. Ta'an*.³⁵⁸

As has been shown above, there is significant evidence which indicates that the incipits of psalms were used from early in the Jewish textual tradition on into at least 200 CE. They were used in some Jewish liturgical contexts both before and after the time of Jesus, in the scriptures and in the Mishnah, respectively. There is also textual evidence from Qumran that indicates that incipits were recognized and interpreted accordingly, and that this practice was still in place around the first century C.E. This leaves open the possibility that Mark has used this same method in Mark 15:34. The liturgical connection (incipits are used most often in worship) is consistent with the dramatic style of the gospel itself and the fact that Jesus' passion has been a common element incorporated into worship since the first century,³⁵⁹ and,

³⁵⁶ Danby, *Mishnah*, 196.

³⁵⁷ *m. Ta'an*. 2:2b.

³⁵⁸ Other examples can be found in *m. Sukkah* 3:9; *m. Bik.* 3:4; and *m. Ber.* 9:2. In *m. Ber.* 9:2 Neusner's translation reads "Blessed is the true judge." Fisher, "Betrayed," 24, notes that "blessed" is only the first word which stands for the phrase "Blessed are thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe."

³⁵⁹ For example, the "lordly supper(s)" (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον) in the early church (1 Cor 11:17-34) and today's Eucharist celebrations are elements in worship that symbolize and are designed to be carried out in the same manner as the selfless sacrifice of Jesus in his death. Cf. Ellen Bradshaw Aitken, *Jesus' Death in Early Christian Memory: The Poetics of the Passion* (NTOA 53; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), for a full-length study on several texts (outside of the gospels) that show the effect of Jesus' death on early Christian memory and its liturgical function in the shaping of Christian communities.

as we shall see below, the use of the psalms in worship and the presence of this particular psalm (Ps 22) in several extra-canonical hymns (both Jewish and Christian) relatively contemporary to Mark's gospel also strengthens the connection.

The Liturgical Use of the Psalms

Before examining how Ps 22 was used in various contemporary circles within Mark's socio-cultural context, it will be beneficial to touch on the way the psalms in general were used in Jewish worship practices around the time of the writing of Mark's gospel. Much of the scholarly discussion of this issue focuses on the liturgical practices of the synagogue in comparison and contrast with temple practices and that of the Qumran community.³⁶⁰ Since all three of these locations (temple, synagogue, Qumran) are part of the larger milieu of Mark's gospel, the evidence of the liturgical practices from these worship locales will be relevant and important for painting a portrait of the use of the psalms in the first century. In further support of this is the presence of close parallels between features of worship in early Christianity and the Qumran texts.³⁶¹ Thus, although the principal concern of scholars has centered on the formal practice of psalmody and prayer in the synagogue,³⁶² it should be reiterated that the issue of worship in the temple prior to its destruction and in the Qumran community is also important as they constitute two

³⁶⁰ For example, see James W. McKinnon, "On the Question of Psalmody in the Ancient Synagogue" *Early Music History* 6 (1986): 159-91; Daniel K. Falk, "Qumran and the Synagogue Liturgy," in *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins Until 200 C.E.: Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001* (eds. B. Olsson and M. Zetterholm; ConBNT 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003), 404-34; and Hughes Oliphant Old, "The Psalms of Praise in the Worship of the New Testament Church," *Int* 39 (1985): 20-33.

³⁶¹ Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy* (2d ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 34. His comments on this subject are worth quoting here: "A particular question is posed here by the various pieces of liturgical material scattered among the Qumran literature. There has been a common tendency to treat the findings of this source as representative only of marginal sectarian practice and so unable to shed any light on wider Jewish liturgical activity prior to the destruction of the Temple . . . however . . . a good deal of what has been discovered there does not bear any marks that would make it exclusive to that particular community, and so it should be treated as reflecting the broader prayer patterns of early Judaism . . . the close parallels that have been observed between a number of other features of early Christianity and the Qumran texts should make us attentive to possible liturgical connections between the two as well."

³⁶² McKinnon, "Question of Psalmody," 159-91, is particularly concerned with this issue.

other arenas in the socio-cultural context of the first century where worship with the psalms was practiced.

In the synagogue practices of the first century, worship primarily centered on the reading of the Torah.³⁶³ Other activities frequently mentioned include discourse on the scripture read and prayer. The silence concerning psalmody in the synagogue is significant, considering the “abundant evidence” of these other activities.³⁶⁴ J. McKinnon interprets this silence to mean that psalmody was not a formal practice in the synagogue until much later:

Surely if it had been customary to recite the daily temple psalm in the synagogue, this vast literature would have made some reference to the practice. Such reference does finally appear in the eighth-century tractate *Sopherim*, which includes the seven daily psalms in the synagogue service, citing the incipit of each.”³⁶⁵

The reason behind the relative silence of texts concerning the liturgical practices of the synagogue has been a source of speculation. According to P. Bradshaw, it is most likely that the little evidence we have of psalmody in the first century (and up through the eighth century) points more to the “private recitation by pious individuals rather than a formal part of synagogue liturgy,” and thus may explain the absence of more evidence of communal psalmody.³⁶⁶ Another suggestion, by D. Falk, is that the silence about prayer in the synagogues before 70 C.E. indicates that the temple was the locus of organized liturgy, and only after its destruction was the synagogue the primary place of prayer.³⁶⁷

³⁶³ Although this should not be emphasized over against other activities that took place there, considering that the equivalent to συναγωγή appears to have been προσευχή, i.e., “place of prayer.” See BDAG, “προσευχή,” 878:2.

³⁶⁴ McKinnon, “Question of Psalmody,” 182.

³⁶⁵ McKinnon, “Question of Psalmody,” 182-83. The reference McKinnon cites is *b. Sop.* 18:1. He later cites *b. Sop.* 17:11 as a possible reference to an earlier practice of psalmody in the synagogue (albeit still well after 70 C.E.). Indications that this is an earlier practice include: (a) the recitation of Pss 145-50 seems to be taken for granted by the writer, as there is no justification offered; and (b) it appears to have been mentioned already in the Talmud as a private practice (although the Babylonian Talmud is itself a much later collection of writings).

³⁶⁶ Bradshaw, *Search*, 38.

³⁶⁷ Falk, “Qumran,” 404-34.

The evidence we do have of psalmody in the synagogue indicates that prayers and the reciting of the psalms were done by chanting, and were sometimes accompanied by music.³⁶⁸ Similarly, according to Philo the practice of chanting hymns during feasts and other ceremonies was a feature of the Essenes, with the likelihood that these hymns were derived from both the psalms and the *Hodayot* (Philo, *Contempl. Life*. 80).³⁶⁹ The fact that the psalms were chanted both by the individual leader of the service and often repeated or “filled in” by the audience of worshippers indicates that the latter would have had to be familiar with the whole psalm in order to participate in this part of the service.

What was the content of the psalmody during this time? Jewish prayer-forms such as the *berakah* and *hodeh/hodayah* centered primarily on the thanksgiving and praise of God during the first century.³⁷⁰ In addition, the evidence of psalmody in the temple practices before its destruction indicates that it formed part of two types of services. First, there is a connection between the performance of a psalm to music by the Levite musicians and the act of the daily sacrifice.³⁷¹ Second, the *Hallel* psalms (Pss 113-118) were sung during major festivals such as the night before Passover, Weeks, Tabernacles, and Hanukah.³⁷² It is also commonly accepted among scholars of ancient liturgy that the earliest appearance of the psalms in the synagogue was in the form of the *Hallel* psalms.³⁷³ Thus, the only tangible evidence that we have of the early psalmody of the synagogue and the temple indicates that the form of psalmody was primarily that of praise to God.

It seems likely, then, that the observation that “the principle vehicle of early Christian chant” was the psalms is an accurate one, as this appears to be the primary

³⁶⁸ See *b. Meg.* 32a; *b. Ber.* 6a; *b. Taʿan* 16a, although the late dates of these texts (Middle Ages) should encourage one to make tentative possible connections with earlier practice without additional evidence. How much later Jewish practices reflect first century practices is difficult to determine.

³⁶⁹ This will be addressed more thoroughly below in the section on Ps 22 in the *Hodayot*.

³⁷⁰ Bradshaw, *Search*, 43-44. He notes that the *hodeh/hodayah* could be understood in a broader sense as a “confession or acknowledgment that something is the case,” rather than being limited to thanksgiving (43).

³⁷¹ McKinnon, “Question of Psalmody,” 163.

³⁷² *b. ʿArak.* 10a.

³⁷³ For example, McKinnon, “Question of Psalmody,” 185. This “early” appearance most likely comes after 70 C.E.

source for liturgy during the first century.³⁷⁴ However, there is little evidence that the specific *Hallel* psalms were incorporated into the liturgy of the early church. The only exception to this might be in the apparent tradition of singing the *Hallel* during the Christian appropriation of the Passover seder, i.e., the *agape* feast. In Mark 14:26 and Matt 26:30, the gospel writers end their narration of Jesus' last Passover supper by mentioning that he and the disciples sang a hymn before going out to the Mount of Olives. Most likely this "hymn" was the *Hallel*, and this practice seems to have been retained up through the third century with the singing of a hymn at the close of the *agape* feast.³⁷⁵

What are the ramifications of the above observations concerning the liturgical use of the psalms in the first century for the overarching purpose of this study (determining how early readers of Mark's gospel would have understood his use of Ps 22 to speak of Jesus)? The relatively sparse evidence we have of psalmody around the first century does illumine our understanding of this form of worship in Mark's socio-cultural context, which will allow some tentative parallels to be drawn between the general psalmody of this time and Mark's specific use of Ps 22. First, the form of psalmody most often portrayed in these texts is that of chanting, which was often accompanied by music. This involved the reciting of a portion of the psalm by the leader of the service which was followed by the rest of the congregation either repeating after him or proceeding to recite the remaining part of the psalm. This practice of chanting implies the knowledge of the whole psalm by the participating congregants. The pervasiveness of this practice in both the synagogues and the Qumran community³⁷⁶ during this time increases the possibility that Mark's implied readers would also have been familiar enough with the psalms to be able to chant them as wholes.³⁷⁷

³⁷⁴ McKinnon, "Question of Psalmody," 159.

³⁷⁵ McKinnon, "Question of Psalmody," 185-86. Tertullian, *Apol.* 39, states that the *agape* feast is followed by the chanting of praises to God either from scripture or those that are original compositions. In addition, Philo, *Contempl. Life*, 64-90, recounts the parallel practice of the Essenes; and Collins, "Appropriation," 230, refers to Hippolytus' *The Apostolic Tradition* 25 (200 C.E.), which describes a communal supper followed by the reciting of psalms.

³⁷⁶ As do many scholars, I understand the "Essenes" mentioned by ancient writers such as Philo and Josephus to be closely identified with the Qumran community.

³⁷⁷ Even though Mark's audience was probably mostly made up of Gentiles, and therefore may or may not have been familiar with contemporary Jewish practices, the influence that the actual reader (the one[s] who read aloud the gospel to the audience) of Mark's gospel would have had in explaining these types of things creates plausibility for this argument. In other words, it was not

In the case of Ps 22, due to its obvious importance both within Christian circles (as evidenced by its presence in all four gospels) and outside of them (for instance, at Qumran), it is likely that Mark's readers would have been able to "fill in" the rest of the psalm upon hearing its opening line. Second, the content of the psalmody around the first century has been shown to be predominantly that of praise. This is true both in the temple and in the synagogue. Since most prayers practiced communally were praises to God, this increases the likelihood that Mark's implied readers would have been familiar with the latter half of Ps 22, the portion of the psalm which constitutes the psalmist's praise of God in the midst of the assembly. Both the setting and content of Ps 22:23-32—in the assembly, the praise of Yahweh—are entirely appropriate to the known practice of psalmody during this period. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, the use of the psalms in the worship of the various Jewish communities of the first century appears to have been a practice picked up by early Christians and directly applied to the person of Jesus (Mark 14:26 and Matt 26:30). The observation of Collins' is worth quoting here:

If the reading, singing, or chanting of the psalms was part of the communal worship of the followers of Jesus from the time of his death onward, these oral performances of the psalms, perhaps associated with homilies or other forms of teaching, may have been the occasion for the re-reading of the psalms of individual lament with reference to the death of Jesus.³⁷⁸

Of the psalms applied by the early Christians to Jesus' death, Ps 22 is clearly the predominant and most provocative of all. The following section of this chapter will examine the appropriation of Ps 22 by other texts and communities roughly contemporary to Mark's gospel in order to understand how this specific text was being used and interpreted within his socio-cultural milieu.

The Textual Use of Psalm 22

There are several writings regarded as relatively contemporary to Mark's gospel (spanning roughly 100 BCE–100 CE) which make use of Ps 22 to portray the

entirely up to the audience to make the connections from their own knowledge. It would have taken only one reader to recognize and explain these issues to the rest of the group. See my more detailed explanation of the function of the reader and the audience in Chapter 1.

³⁷⁸ Collins, "Appropriation," 230-31.

experiences of their protagonists. These include Wisdom of Solomon, *Odes of Solomon*, *Joseph and Aseneth*, and the *Hodayot* of Qumran. An examination of these will help us to understand how Ps 22 functioned in Mark's socio-cultural context, which may in turn help us to understand how Mark's implied readers would have interpreted his use of Ps 22 in his narrative of Jesus' passion and resurrection. To that end, there are several questions which will be kept in mind during the course of this investigation: Is there any pattern among these multiple allusions to Ps 22? Is the thanksgiving portion of the psalm ever used, or is the lament portion always privileged? Does the "plot" of Ps 22 ever fit in its new context and is there any indication of its relevance there? Is the protagonist of the text—the one for whom the language of Ps 22 is employed—ever portrayed as a Righteous Sufferer? At the end of my discussion of these texts, I will return to these questions as a way of summing up the relevant data uncovered.

Wisdom of Solomon 2 and 5

The argument that Wis 2—5 is closely related to, and even dependent upon, Ps 22 is not a novel one.³⁷⁹ This relationship manifests itself in at least three ways. First, there are several passages in Wis 2—5 that are strong allusions to Ps 22. Second, Wis 2—5 shares several thematic parallels with the psalm, specifically in the situations of the respective protagonists. Third, by its use of Ps 22, Wis 2—5 portrays his protagonist as a Righteous Sufferer, going even further than the psalm (and interpreting it?) in explicitly identifying him as "the righteous one" (ὁ δίκαιος).³⁸⁰

In Wis 2:12 and Wis 5:4 allusions to Ps 22:7 are present in the adoption of the language of "reproach," which shares the root of ὀνειδος (in the psalm) and appears in verb form in 2:12 (ὀνειδίζω) and in a different noun form in 5:4 (ὀνειδισμός). The nature of ὀνειδίζει as an allusion to Ps 22:7 may be questioned by the intriguing role reversal portrayed in Wis 2:12, where the Righteous Sufferer reproaches his foes, rather than being the object of reproach. However, Wis 5:4 returns to a more traditional interpretation of the passage, where the Righteous

³⁷⁹ For example, see Hoffman, "Psalm 22 (LXX 21)," 293-95.

³⁸⁰ Wis 2:10, 12, 18; 5:1.

Sufferer is reproached by his enemies, as is the psalmist.³⁸¹ Another allusion to Ps 22 is located in Wis 2:18, where the persecutors of the Righteous Sufferer adhere to the same reasoning that the enemies of the psalmist display in Ps 22:9:

Wisdom 2:18 εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ δίκαιος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἀντιλήμψεται αὐτοῦ καὶ ῥύσεται αὐτὸν ἐκ χειρὸς ἀνθεστηκότων

For if the righteous one is son of God, then he will help him and deliver him from his adversaries.

לֹא אֶל-יְהוָה יִפְלְטֵהוּ יִצְיֵלֵהוּ כִּי תִפְּצֵן בּוֹ Psalm 22:9

Commit to the Lord; let him deliver him. Let him rescue him for he delights in him.

LXX Psalm 21:9 ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ κύριον ῥυσάσθω αὐτόν σωσάτω αὐτόν ὅτι θέλει αὐτόν

He hoped upon the Lord; let *him deliver him*; let *him save him since he delights in him*.

Thus, the enemies of both figures have the same goal in mind when they persecute the Righteous Sufferer: they consider this punishment as a type of test for the two figures, and believe that the absence of deliverance from the Lord indicates that he does not claim the victim as his own.

There might also be an allusion to Ps 22:21 here as well, with the reference to the potential for the deliverance of the Righteous Sufferer from the “hand of those who oppose him.” Similar language is used in LXX Ps 21:21, where the translators have interpreted כַּף literally as “hand” rather than “power.” This verse constitutes a plea for deliverance from the psalmist’s enemies, a request that is answered in the following portion of the psalm. The allusion to this verse in Wis 2:18 indicates a correspondence between the “dog/dogs” of Ps 22:21 and 17, and the persecutors of the Righteous Sufferer.

³⁸¹ Echoes of Ps 22:7 might also be present in Wis 4:18, where the collective “righteous” are “scorned” by the “unrighteous.” The verb used here (ἐξουθενέω) is derived from the same root as the noun in Ps 22:7 (ἐξουδένημα).

There also exist several thematic parallels between Wis 2—5 and Ps 22. First, the protagonist in each text experiences persecution at the hands of his enemies, as Wis 2:12-20 shares the general “plot” of Ps 22:7-9. Second, the suffering of both the psalmist and the Righteous Sufferer of Wis 2—5 is considered to have eschatological ramifications which include his vindication, and this suffering is believed to be universal in its effect (Ps 22:28-32; Wis 3:8; 5:1-5).³⁸² Third, both narrations of the opposition that the figures face are told from the perspective of the enemies in the first person (Ps 22:9; Wis 2:10-20).

Considering the previous discussion in this chapter of the existence of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer before and during the first century, the presence of “the righteous one” as a title for the protagonist of Wis 2—5 is significant. Even more important for this study is the fact that the persecution and anticipated vindication of this Righteous Sufferer is narrated in language that is largely taken from Ps 22! This suggests that the writer of Wis 2—5 regarded the psalmist as a “righteous one” as well, and this lends strong support for interpreting the psalm as the lament and thanksgiving of a Righteous Sufferer figure.³⁸³

Odes of Solomon

A roughly contemporary writing of Mark in the Pseudepigrapha that uses the language of Ps 22 is *Odes of Solomon*. *Odes Sol.* is a collection of hymns which appear to be Christian at least in their present form.³⁸⁴ Usually regarded as a work written between the late first century and the early second century, Charlesworth

³⁸² There might also be an allusion to Ps 22:29 in Wis 3:8, which carries the eschatological theme of the reign of God over all nations.

³⁸³ *Contra* Hoffman, “Psalm 22 (LXX 21),” 293-95, whose zeal to deny the existence of a tradition of the Righteous Sufferer becomes evident in his discussion of the protagonist of Wis 2—5: “. . . Wis 2—5 is an important witness to how religious titles could be used. Though Wisdom of Solomon speaks of a person who is designated a ‘righteous one’ . . . still, this does not mean that the person is being depicted as a unique and exceptional character. Rather, the person is only serving as an example of what all the righteous ones are like” (293). Yet I would argue that the two are not incompatible; a figure can serve as an exemplar for the community and still be considered unique and exceptional. This is precisely how both the Teacher of Righteousness and the Markan Jesus are presented, for example. Hoffman’s objections to regarding the psalmist of Ps 22 as a Righteous Sufferer figure who belongs to the tradition of the Righteous Sufferer will be challenged in the following chapter.

³⁸⁴ James H. Charlesworth, introduction to *Odes of Solomon* in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983), 725. All translations of *Odes Sol.* are Charlesworth’s.

I trusted, consequently I was at rest;
because trustful is he in whom I trusted.

This same combination of the motifs of trust in God and the speaker's beginnings in his mother's womb is present in Ps 22:10-11:

כִּי־אַתָּה נָתַנִּי מִבֶּטֶן מִבְטִיחִי עַל־שָׁדַי אִמִּי:¹⁰
עַל־יָדְךָ הִשְׁלַכְתִּי מִרְחֹם מִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי אֵלַי אָתָּה:¹¹

For you brought me forth from the womb;
You caused me to trust (while) upon my mother's breasts.
Upon you I was cast from birth;
From my mother's womb you have been my God.

The language of Ps 22 is especially noticeable in *Odes Sol.* 28:9-20, where Christ's circumstances are described in language taken from Ps 22.³⁸⁹ This section of the hymn recounts the persecutions of Christ's enemies, specifically using the imagery of him being surrounded by dogs (*Odes Sol.* 28:14), and his enemies casting lots against him (28:18). What is significant for our purposes is that, although none of the thanksgiving portion of the psalm is clearly alluded to in *Odes Sol.* 28, the end of the hymn does stress that the persecutors' plan was ultimately in vain, and ends with a "Hallelujah" (28:19-20)! Thus, like the "plot" of Ps 22, *Odes Sol.* 28 also contains both elements of lament and praise, emphasizing the futility of the enemies' schemes and praising the power of God in thwarting them. In addition, there may also be a faint allusion to Ps 22:19-20 in *Odes Sol.* 28:5, which denies the separation of the Odist from God and speaks of the threat of this separation in the same terms as the psalm (the threat of the sword). Another allusion to Ps 22 is found in *Odes Sol.* 31:9, which also speaks of the dividing up of the belongings of Christ in the midst of persecution by his enemies (*Odes Sol.* 31:8-13).

³⁸⁹ Here I am following Charlesworth, who thinks that the Odist is speaking as Christ from 28:9-20.

Joseph and Aseneth

Also belonging to the Pseudepigrapha, *Joseph and Aseneth* is widely regarded as a Jewish work (perhaps with some Christian interpolations), and is usually dated somewhere between 100 B.C.E. and 150 C.E.³⁹⁰ An explanatory story about the marriage of Joseph and the Egyptian Aseneth recorded in Gen 41:45, *Jos Asen.* is told from the perspective of Aseneth. Possible allusions to Ps 22 are found in two passages, both of which describe the fasting and repentance of Aseneth concerning her former life of idol worship. *Jos Asen.* 12:9 and 12:11 use the metaphor of a lion to speak of the persecution she endures (the source of her persecution may be understood as a Satan-like figure³⁹¹ and/or the temptation to continue her former idol worship). The first passage's use of the same metaphor as that found in Ps 22:14 is not significant on its own, because the lion metaphor is a relatively common one.³⁹² However, its combination with the additional allusion to Ps 22:22 two verses later, in which Aseneth pleads for God's rescue from the *mouth* of the lion (καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ [λέων] ἐξελοῦ με) makes the connection to Ps 22 much stronger. Despite the shared metaphor of the threat of persecution depicted as the mouth of a lion, the context of Aseneth's prayer to God is entirely different from that of the psalmist and must be kept in mind. Aseneth is repenting of her sins of former idol worship and is begging for God's rescue from this former way of life. The psalmist indicates no such connection between his sins and the persecution that he faces at the hands of his enemies. The second allusion to Ps 22 is located in *Jos Asen.* 13:9. Aseneth's fasting results in her mouth being dry and her lips becoming "like a potsherd (ὡς ὄστρακον)." This is reminiscent of the language of Ps 22:16a: "My strength is dried up like a potsherd (ἐξηράνθη ὡς ὄστρακον ἡ ἰσχὺς μου; כִּי בִבְרֶשֶׁת יִבֶּשׁ בִּבְרֶשֶׁת) and my tongue clings to my jaw." However, the circumstances between the two speakers (Aseneth and the psalmist) are clearly different, the most obvious being that Aseneth's condition of discomfort is self-imposed; it is not a direct result of persecution by her enemies.

³⁹⁰ Christoph Burchard, introduction to *Joseph and Aseneth* in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983), 187.

³⁹¹ Hoffman, "Psalm 22 (LXX 21)," 154, reads it this way. These options are not mutually exclusive, as Satan's business is often presented as one of testing or temptation (e.g., Job 1-2; Mark 1:13; Matt 4:1-10).

³⁹² Cf. Ps 7:3; *Apoc. El.* 2:7; 2 Tim 4:17; and 1 Pet 5:8.

The *Hodayot* of the Qumran Community

The *Hodayot* of the Qumran community, written sometime before 100 BCE,³⁹³ also make significant use of Ps 22. This is particularly appropriate, since we have already seen that its leader—the Teacher of Righteousness—functioned as a prototype of the community in his role as a Righteous Sufferer figure who endured persecution for his faithfulness to God. As we shall see, Ps 22 provides some of the language in the *Hodayot* for the expression of both the persecution that the Teacher and his community experiences and their anticipated deliverance and vindication.³⁹⁴

Several allusions to the lament portion of Ps 22 are included in the *Hodayot*. In 1QH X,33-35 there is the same combination of “reproach” (חרפה) and “scorn” (בזו) that is found in Ps 22:7,³⁹⁵ a combination which is present nowhere else in the MT. Like the psalmist, the Teacher finds himself being derided by his persecutors: “they made me an object of scorn and reproach in the mouth of all the seekers of falsehood.”³⁹⁶ Like Ps 22:14 and 22, the Teacher also adopts the metaphor of the lion (אריה) and uses the same phrase in Ps 22:14, “they open their mouths against me,” in the negative to speak of the thwarted posture of his enemies in 1QH XIII,6-19 (פיהם ופצו עלי).³⁹⁷

Allusions to Ps 22:15 are also present in several Qumran hymns. The first and most explicit is in 1QH XII,33-34, which describes the anguish of the speaker (the Teacher?) in the terms used by the psalm:

³⁹³ James H. Charlesworth, “Jewish Hymns, Odes, and Prayers (ca. 167 B.C.E. – 135 C.E.)” in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (eds. R. A. Kraft and G. W. E. Nickelsburg; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 413.

³⁹⁴ Geza Vermes, introduction to *The Thanksgiving Hymns in Complete*, 244, singles out hymns 1, 2, and 7-11 as those written from the perspective of the Teacher of Righteousness, without excluding the possibility of others belonging to this group.

³⁹⁵ The slightly different form בזוה is present in Ps 22:7.

³⁹⁶ 1QH X,33b. My translation. 1QH X,9-12 might also be an allusion to Ps 22:7, with its reference to the abusive language of his enemies.

³⁹⁷ Note that the Teacher is also said to be in the midst of (בתוך) the lionesses (לביאים) when God saves him, which is reminiscent of the psalmist being surrounded by (סבב) his enemies in Ps 22:13. This passage also has strong allusions to the episode of the lions’ den in Dan 6, another in the motif of the Righteous Sufferer.

ואני רעד ורתת אחזוני וכול ירועו וימס לבבי כדונג מ/פני אש וילכו
ברכי

כמים מוגרים במורד

As for me, shaking and trembling seize me

and all my bones are broken;

my heart melts like wax before fire

and my knees are like water

pouring down a steep place.

Psalm 22:15 כמים נשפכתי וְהִתְפַּרְדּוּ כָּל-עֲצָמוֹתַי הִיָּה לִבִּי כְדוֹנָג

נָמַס בְּתוֹךְ מִעִי:

I am poured out like water and all my bones are divided.

My heart has become like wax;

It is melted within my belly.

Ps 22:15 is the only place in the MT which speaks of a person's heart melting like wax, making it clearly the intertext used by the writer of 1QH XII,33-34. Note also the shared motif of the damage to the sufferer's bones.³⁹⁸ There is, however, one major difference in the contexts of the two speakers' suffering. In 1QH XII, the allusion to Ps 22 is combined with an allusion to Mic 1:4, a link which is provided by the shared language of "melt" (מָסַח), "wax" (דוֹנָג), and "water" (מֵיָה). It is the following verse of Mic 1:5 which may provide the context for the Qumran speaker's admission of his sins in initially blaming God's Covenant for the suffering he has endured, a thought which is not present in the psalm. 1QH XVI,32-34 also contains a description of the sufferings of the speaker in terms used by or similar to Ps 22:15:

My strength has gone from my body

and my *heart* runs out like *water*;

³⁹⁸ The dividing or breaking of bones is also mentioned in 1QH XV,4 (יִתְפַּרְדּוּ עֲצָמַי).

my flesh is *melted* like wax
 and the strength of my loins is turned to fear.
My arm is torn from its socket
 and I can] lift my hand [no more];
 My [foot] is held by fetters
 and my knees slide like *water*;

The descriptions of the discomfort of the speaker of these hymns also include an allusion to Ps 22:16: “My strength is dried up like a potsherd *and my tongue clings to my jaw* (וּלְשׁוֹנִי מִדְבָּק מִלְקוּחָי).” 1QH XIII,31 uses the language of the second half of the verse: “I am clothed in blackness and *my tongue cleaves to the roof* [of my mouth]. . .” (וּלְשׁוֹנִי לַהֵךְ תִּדְבֵּק).³⁹⁹ Finally, allusions to Ps 22:10-11 may be present in 1QH VII,15-17; 1QH XI,9-10; and 1QH XVII,29-36, in the shared themes of “birth” and “womb.”⁴⁰⁰

Allusions to the thanksgiving portion of the psalm are also found in these hymns. 1QH XX,3 reads: “I will praise your name in the midst of those who fear you”⁴⁰¹ (וְאֶהְלֵלָה שְׁמִיכָה בְּתוֹךְ יֹרְאֵיכָה), which echoes the language of Ps 22:23-24:

אֶסְפָּרָה שְׁמִי לְאֶחָי בְּתוֹךְ קָהָל אֶהְלֵלָךְ:²³
 יִרְאֵי יְהוָה תִּלְלוּהוּ כָּל־זֶרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל וְגִירוֹ מִמֶּנּוּ²⁴
 כָּל־זֶרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל:

I will tell of your name to my brothers;
in the midst of the congregation I will *praise* you.
 Those who *fear* Yahweh, *praise* him;
 all you descendents of Jacob, honor him;
 and stand in awe of him, all you descendents of Israel.

³⁹⁹ Steichele, *Der leidende Sohn Gottes*, 246, emphasizes the presence of this allusion to Ps 22 in a hymn which has clear eschatological overtones as an indication that this psalm was being read and interpreted in this manner. So also, Marcus, *Way*, 178-79.

⁴⁰⁰ See Hoffman, “Psalm 22 (LXX 21),” 85-89, for a lengthy discussion of these allusions.

⁴⁰¹ My translation.

Language of God's care for the poor and needy similar to that of Ps 22:25 is found in two hymns, in 1QH X,33-34 and 1QH XIII,12-19. Just as the psalmist considers himself a representative of the poor (עָנִי) in that God's deliverance of him from his persecutors is an indication of his overall concern for these afflicted ones (Ps 22:25), so also does the Teacher deftly move from speaking of God's care of the collective poor ("But you, my God, have helped the poor and the needy"; אֱלֹהֵי עֲזָרְתָה נַפְשִׁי וְרַשׁ; ⁴⁰² וְאֶתְּהִי) to focusing on his own deliverance from his enemies as an example of this care in 1QH X,34. Once again we have a clear example of both speakers functioning as the prototype and exemplar for their respective communities.

Although Ps 22:2 is not cited or alluded to in the *Hodayot* of the Qumran community, the extensive use which the writer makes of both sections of the psalm is significant and helpful for understanding how this psalm was used and interpreted in the socio-cultural context of Mark's gospel. Particularly significant is the manner in which the Teacher of Righteousness (and, by extension, his community) invests his own story of persecution with the language of Ps 22—both in lament and in thanksgiving—which corresponds to the way Mark invests his story of Jesus with the language of this psalm.⁴⁰³ This appears in two forms in Mark, as a narration of his experiences (from the perspective of a third party) and from the lips of Jesus himself (Mark 15:34). The latter closely mirrors both Ps 22 and its allusions in the *Hodayot*, as the Markan Jesus becomes the narrator of his own experience. In addition, in both the *Hodayot* and Mark's gospel, the experiences of the suffering leader of the community become representative of the same sufferings that members of his group are facing, or can expect to face.

It is also significant that at least some of the *Hodayot* appear to have been used as liturgy for celebratory occasions and other events.⁴⁰⁴ Vermes sees in Philo's account of the Essenes' Pentecost Feast probable evidence for this, as Philo tells of the practice of the leader of the meeting to chant a hymn of praise to God at the close of the meeting, with the rest of the community chanting after him (Philo, *Contempl. Life*. 80).⁴⁰⁵ Vermes also thinks it probable that at least two hymns (4 and 5) were

⁴⁰² My translation.

⁴⁰³ So also, Brown, *Death*, 2:1459.

⁴⁰⁴ Charlesworth, "Jewish Hymns," 414.

⁴⁰⁵ See Vermes, "Introduction," 244.

chanted by the community during the Feast of the Renewal of the Covenant to mark the entry of new members into the community. He even goes so far as to propose that *all* of the *Hodayot* might have been composed for the liturgy of special occasions.⁴⁰⁶ If he is correct, this may be one of the strongest pieces of evidence, albeit indirect, for Ps 22 being used in worship around the time of Mark's gospel, lending credence to the notion that this psalm would have been known in whole by his implied readers (and thus, that they would have been expected to recognize the impact of a contextual citation in Mark 15:34). The presence of allusions to both the lament and thanksgiving sections of the psalm in the *Hodayot* certainly indicates that at least the Qumran community was familiar with the whole psalm.

Analysis of Results

Now that we have examined the allusions to Ps 22 in Wis 2—5, *Odes Sol.*, *Jos. Asen.*, and the *Hodayot* of Qumran, we can return to the questions posed at the beginning of this section. *Is there any pattern among the allusions to Ps 22?* A citation or allusion to Ps 22:2 is not found in any of these texts. However, Ps 22 is repeatedly used to portray each protagonist as one who experiences persecution from his/her enemies and seeks deliverance from God. Often the portions of the psalm used are the verses that contain a description of the physical suffering of the speaker, but there is also emphasis on his mental and emotional abuse.

Is the thanksgiving portion of the psalm ever used, or is the lament portion always privileged? There exist strong allusions to both portions of the psalm (lament and thanksgiving) in Wis, *Odes Sol.*, and the *Hodayot*. In addition, the exclamation of trust in God found in Ps 22:5-6 and 10-11 is used as praise to God for his acts on behalf of the speaker.

Does the "plot" of Ps 22 ever fit in its new context and is there any indication of its relevance there? Wis 2—5 is a prime example of a text that has adopted the "plot" of the psalmist for its own protagonist. This is also evident in the shared theme of the eschatological efficacy of each protagonist's suffering and vindication by God, a theme which is found in the latter portion of the psalm and provides a key element of its plot. In addition, 1QH XIII,6-19 contains several allusive elements to this plot

⁴⁰⁶ Vermes, "Introduction," 244.

with regard to the Teacher, while combining this with allusions to the plot of the persecution and vindication of another Righteous Sufferer, Daniel (Dan 6).

Is the protagonist of the text—the one for whom the language of Ps 22 is employed—ever portrayed as a Righteous Sufferer? Once again, this is most clearly evident in Wis 2—5, where the protagonist is called “the righteous one.” The adoption of the language of Ps 22 to describe the circumstances of this Righteous Sufferer provides a strong link between the two figures, and indicates that the writer of Wis 2—5 understood the psalmist to be a Righteous Sufferer figure as well. In addition, the use of Ps 22 to describe the circumstances of the Teacher of Righteousness and his community in the *Hodayot* also provides evidence that this psalm was used in Mark’s socio-cultural context to talk about the Righteous Sufferers of other communities.

Conclusions

By way of conclusion, let me summarize the key findings of this chapter. First, it has become clear through our examination of the relevant material that the motif of the Righteous Sufferer was indeed a widespread tradition in Jewish literature before and during the first century. Second, at least two Righteous Sufferer figures—the protagonist of Wis 2—5 and the Teacher of Righteousness of the Qumran community—were described in language derived from Ps 22. Third, both the lament and thanksgiving portions of Ps 22 were used to talk about the Righteous Sufferer figures in *Odes Sol.*, the *Hodayot*, and Wis 2—5. Fourth, the literary (and oral) device of incipits existed before, during and after the time of Mark’s gospel, lending support to the possibility that Mark also used this device in 15:34 and that his implied readers would have recognized it and interpreted the passage accordingly. Fifth, the chanting of hymns—which often included the psalms—existed at Qumran, and was also a practice of the temple liturgy for several occasions (sacrifice and festivals). This practice of chanting the psalms also increases the likelihood that the participants had knowledge of whole psalms, and this likelihood—by extension—increases with regard to Mark’s implied readers. This may be supported even further by the evidence of the singing of hymns (possibly the psalms) by early Christians associated with Jesus’ death via the *agape* feast.

Chapter 6

Jesus as Mark's Righteous Sufferer

After sifting through the evidence that supports and the arguments which dispute the existence of a cohesive tradition of the Righteous Sufferer at the time of the writing of Mark's gospel, we now come to the crux of the issue for this study. How does the information we have gathered in the previous chapter shed any light on how—or even whether—Mark presents Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer? Even more specifically, how does this contribute to an understanding of how Mark's implied readers would have interpreted Jesus' cry from the cross in Mark 15:34? Given the evidence for the existence of this tradition of the Righteous Sufferer in the scriptures, extra-canonical literature, and especially in 4QpPs^a, 1QpHab, and the *Hodayot* (1QH) of the Qumran community, it is likely that Mark's implied readers would have been expected to be familiar with this tradition (Righteous Sufferer) and to be able to recognize the similarities that might be present between past Righteous Sufferer figures and the experiences of the Markan Jesus. This is not because there is any evidence of a dependent relationship between Mark's gospel and these other texts from contemporary communities. Rather, the presence of the Righteous Sufferer tradition in these contemporary texts indicates that this motif was “in the air” during the time of Mark's gospel, and thus makes it more plausible that Mark also draws upon the motif.

There are two primary types of evidence in Mark's gospel which suggest that the motif of the Righteous Sufferer is a crucial lens from which to view Jesus. First, there are several themes throughout the narrative that tie into and fill out the portrayal of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer. Second, there are specific elements of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer which are present in Mark's PRN, the section of the gospel which encompasses our focal passage, Mark 15:34.⁴⁰⁷ Each of these will be discussed in this chapter.

⁴⁰⁷ My distinction between the larger Markan narrative and his PRN is not based on assumptions about the redaction history of the gospel (whether Mark received the PRN or whether it is an original composition), but rather is a strategy used to gradually, but increasingly, focus my study on the portion of the gospel which forms the immediate cotext of our focal passage, Mark 15:34. Thus, I do not see Mark's use of the tradition of the Righteous Sufferer in Mark 1-13 as fundamentally distinct from that of Mark 14-16.

The Righteous Sufferer in the Larger Markan Narrative

The issue of Jesus' identity is one of great focus in Mark's narrative, from the beginning (Mark 1:1), to the middle (8:29), and through to the very end (16:6). We have already observed how the Markan Jesus wears several different "hats," which include "Christ," "son of God," "Son of man," and "teacher."⁴⁰⁸ These are all labels which are explicitly attributed to Jesus in the narrative. However, there are other labels of identity which are applied to Jesus in a more implicit manner. It will be argued below that one of these is the Righteous Sufferer.⁴⁰⁹

We have already seen that the issue of martyrdom became an important element of the Righteous Sufferer traditions during its later stages, the prime example being in the books of the Maccabees.⁴¹⁰ J. Gniska has written a short monograph discussing the sayings of Jesus which contain martyr-like language.⁴¹¹ For him, the focal passages of this motif are Mark 8:35 and 10:39. He sees in these two sayings a martyr element evident in their preparation of the disciples to expect conflict and persecution for the sake of the gospel and their community, with the former demanding readiness actively to accept this martyrdom.⁴¹²

It is notable that both of these passages—Mark 8:35 and 10:39—are located immediately following two of Jesus' three passion-resurrection predictions (8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34), sayings which emphasize the necessity of his suffering. According to Bayer, these passion-resurrection predictions involve both elements of suffering and vindication of the righteous in the form of resurrection; elements which have their background in the motif of the Righteous Sufferer.⁴¹³ At the same time, he cautions against assuming that this Righteous Sufferer tradition forms the exclusive background of these predictions, noting that there are a variety of themes which

⁴⁰⁸ For example, see Mark 8:29; 1:1; 2:10; and 11:21, respectively.

⁴⁰⁹ Other implicit labels can be derived from Jesus' actions (healer and exorcist: Mark 1:23-2:12), and mission (possibly "Suffering Servant": Mark 10:45).

⁴¹⁰ Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*, 27-28.

⁴¹¹ Joachim Gniska, *Jesu ipsissima mors: Der Tod Jesu im Lichte seiner Martyriumsparänese* (Eichstätter Hochschulreden 38; Munich: Minerva, 1983). Gniska is interested in the historical Jesus' sayings, but most often uses as his evidence sayings from Mark's gospel.

⁴¹² Gniska, *Jesu ipsissima mors*, 9, 14.

⁴¹³ Bayer, *Predictions*, 239, 255-56. Bayer uses the language of "stages," regarding the first to deal with the vindication of the righteous (for example, Ps 3, 8, 8, 27, 56) and the second containing the more specific vindication in the form of resurrection (Wis 2 and 5).

contribute to this expectation of suffering and vindication.⁴¹⁴ Nickelsburg also sees this paradigm of persecution and vindication manifested in the passion-resurrection predictions of Mark's gospel.⁴¹⁵

Another element of the Righteous Sufferer tradition may be found in the passages that implicitly assert Jesus' innocence and the injustice of his suffering, a pervasive theme throughout those texts which belong to the motif of the Righteous Sufferer. Although never explicitly called "righteous," it is clear from Mark's narrative that Jesus is the one who follows the will of God, as opposed to those with whom he engages in conflict and who eventually bring about his arrest and crucifixion. A prime example of this can be found in the parable of the tenants, its companion scriptural citation, and the reaction of those to whom the parable is directed in Mark 12:1-12. Here, Jesus is clearly represented as the beloved son (12:6) who is murdered precisely because of his lineage, rather than due to any action that he does or does not take (12:7). This brings about the condemnation of those who participate in his death, since they are the guilty party. Jesus' righteousness may also be indicated in the passages which depict his suffering (and vindication) as an event which takes place because it is God's will, rather than being initiated by anything Jesus does or says. As we have seen in Chapter 3 of this study, this may be the meaning of the $\delta\epsilon\iota$ in Mark 8:31.⁴¹⁶

I have already discussed in a section of the previous chapter how the Teacher of Righteousness was understood as a prototype for the Qumran community. In this way, passages in the *Hodayot*, for example, which appear to refer to the individual and personal experience of the Teacher, are also taken up and used to describe the experiences of the community to which he belongs. J. Marcus words this communal aspect well: "the 'I' who speaks in the *Hodayoth* . . . attains a certain measure of universality."⁴¹⁷ Marcus points out the existence of this same communal dimension

⁴¹⁴ Bayer, *Predictions*, 241-42. He stresses that the passion-resurrection predictions contain many themes which cannot be "reduced to one motif under the influence of which the Synoptic vindication/resurrection predictions developed. While the possibility of interconnection between various motifs and themes is mirrored in our cluster of sayings, a genealogical dependence upon this background is not discernible" (241).

⁴¹⁵ George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 111.

⁴¹⁶ This may also be indicated in Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane (Mark 14:36).

⁴¹⁷ Marcus, *Way*, 185.

in the group of psalms which he terms the “Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer,” of which Ps 22 is a part.⁴¹⁸ This communal aspect is also present throughout Mark’s narrative in his presentation of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer. Like the prototypical Teacher and his community, in Mark’s gospel, Jesus and his disciples also share this similarity of persecution by the opposition (Jesus’ persecution is recounted, while the disciples’ is projected into the future).⁴¹⁹ The general theme of discipleship is a pervading concern of Mark’s gospel. One of the primary indicators of true discipleship is for a Christian to follow Jesus in actively accepting the suffering and possible death that will come with this identity (Mark 8:34-35; 10:42-45; 13:9-13). This is intimately tied up with his own experience of suffering and death, a fact which is clearly indicated by the three-fold repetition in the narrative of Jesus’ passion-resurrection predictions (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34) which are immediately followed by instructions for discipleship (8:34-35; 9:35-37; 10:42-45).⁴²⁰ Thus, for Mark’s gospel, the person of Jesus functions as one who provides the example of the attitude and action which his followers (both the disciples within the narrative and Mark’s implied readers without) must imitate. Like the Righteous Sufferer(s) of the Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer and the Teacher of Righteousness for the Qumran community, Jesus is presented as the prototype of the Markan community. It is his identity as the Righteous Sufferer⁴²¹—which involves persecution from those who

⁴¹⁸ Marcus, *Way*, 172, states that these correspond to Gunkel’s category of the “laments of the individual,” and prefers the label “Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer” because it is “more descriptive of the actual content of the psalms.” Cf. Hermann Gunkel, *Die Psalmen* (HKAT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926).

⁴¹⁹ Another link between the two portrayals of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Qumran community and Jesus and his disciples (who represent Mark’s Christian community), is the presentation of both prototypes as “privileged” teachers (Jokiranta, “Prototypical Teacher,” 259). For the Teacher of Righteousness, this is indicated by his status as an interpreter (4QpPs^a I,25-II,1) and receiver of revelation (1QpHab VII,3-5), which reflects the community’s self-understanding. This may be similar to Mark’s portrayal of Jesus as one who has “authority” (Mark 1:27; 2:10).

⁴²⁰ See Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 22-25, for a detailed discussion of the rhetorical effect of this pattern on the reader’s interpretation.

⁴²¹ As I have mentioned before, this is not the only identity which the Markan Jesus possesses. He is also, among other things, son of God, Christ, teacher, and healer. It is also interesting to note that the Teacher of Righteousness of the Qumran community shared other roles that the Markan Jesus filled, such as that of prophet, teacher, interpreter of scriptures, and possibly messiah. Cf. Byrskog, *Only Teacher*, 123-30, for an in-depth discussion of this issue.

are antagonistic towards him and his mission—that sums up what it means to be part of the community which bears his name.⁴²²

All of these individual elements scattered throughout the narrative of the gospel (the martyr elements in the sayings of Jesus, the “Son of man” passion-resurrection predictions, the presentation of Jesus as one who suffers an undeserved fate, and his function as the prototype for the disciples and their community) contribute toward an overall portrayal of Jesus’ identity as a Righteous Sufferer. It is true that he is not addressed explicitly as such within the narrative—as he is called “Christ” or “Rabbi”—but perhaps this is due to the Righteous Sufferer functioning more as a motif rather than as a title. Nevertheless, Mark’s interest in providing a portrait of Jesus as one who anticipates and experiences suffering in persecution as well as vindication by God fits nicely within the motif of the Righteous Sufferer which we have already located in the scriptures, extra-canonical literature, and the Qumran documents, and the sheer frequency with which Mark discusses Jesus’ impending (within the narrative) suffering, death, and resurrection⁴²³ indicates the importance of this element in his gospel.⁴²⁴

This opinion is not held by all Markan (or gospel) scholars, however. Apparent from the title of his monograph, *Messianic Exegesis*, Juel argues that the primary identity of Jesus portrayed by the gospels’ use of the scriptures was that of Messiah.⁴²⁵ As evidence for this, he points to the fact that in the passion narratives Jesus is executed as king. He denies that Jesus is ever presented as a Righteous Sufferer⁴²⁶ and sees a portrayal of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer as incompatible with his primary identity as messianic king:

It is difficult to understand how the story of a paradigmatic “righteous sufferer” could have been transformed into an account of the death of the King of the Jews and Christ, the King of Israel. It is conceivable, however,

⁴²² Marcus, *Way*, 185, lists other evidence of the communal dimension of Mark’s Righteous Sufferer. This includes Jesus’ calling of the disciples to be with him (Mark 3:14) and their participation in his “charismatic endowment” by God (13:11).

⁴²³ See Chapter 3 of this study.

⁴²⁴ The fact that Luke’s centurion at the cross calls Jesus “δίκαιος” may indicate that early readers of Mark’s gospel did indeed recognize Jesus’ function as a Righteous Sufferer. See Chapter 9 of this study for a discussion of Matthew and Luke as Mark’s earliest tangible readers.

⁴²⁵ See his programmatic statements in the introduction: Juel, *Exegesis*, 1-3.

⁴²⁶ Juel, *Exegesis*, 102.

that material from the psalms could have been employed to tell the story of the King.⁴²⁷

Thus, for Juel, the appropriation of texts such as Ps 22, 31, and 69 by the gospel writers is a midrashic exegesis designed to present Jesus as the Messiah.⁴²⁸ It is this royal background, rather than a Righteous Sufferer background, which explains the use of these psalms by the earliest traditions of Jesus' death.⁴²⁹

Juel shares the same reservations voiced by M. Hengel. Hengel's objection to the efficacy of interpreting and understanding Mark's narrative of Jesus' death in terms of the tradition of the Righteous Sufferer is embraced by Juel and is worth quoting at length:

. . . attempts have been made to see the death of Jesus not so much in traditional terms, as that of the suffering messianic servant of God; instead, the widespread theme of the 'righteous sufferer' has been used to interpret the passion of Jesus, and reference has been made in this connection to the use of the psalms of suffering in the Marcan passion narrative. Here we are supposed to have a version of the pattern of the humiliation and exaltation of the innocent, of a similar kind to the one which also appears in Wisdom 2-5. A one-sided introduction of this theme, however, misinterprets the intention of the passion in Mark. The pattern of the humiliation and exaltation of the righteous is far too general and imprecise to interpret the event which Mark narrates so skilfully and with such deep theological reflection. He is concerned with the utterly unique event of the passion and crucifixion of the Messiah of Israel which is without any parallel in the history of religion. For Mark, the few psalms of suffering which illuminate individual features of the suffering and death of Jesus, like Psalms 22 and 69, are exclusively *messianic* psalms, such as Psalms 110 and 118. The 'righteous' does not appear in connection with Jesus either in the two psalms or in Mark. . . Where features from the suffering of the righteous man appear, for example in the mocking

⁴²⁷ Juel, *Exegesis*, 103. Note that Juel's interests are slightly different from that of this study in that I do not share his concern to determine the catalyst(s) for the attribution of the title "Christ" to Jesus.

⁴²⁸ Juel, *Exegesis*, 104-110, goes on to argue that it is Ps 89 which provides the starting point for this midrashic interpretation of these psalms as messianic.

⁴²⁹ Cf. Juel, *Exegesis*, 90.

of Jesus, they are also in a messianic key. The suffering ‘of the righteous’ is to be integrated completely and utterly into the suffering of the Messiah. *The Messiah alone is the righteous and sinless one par excellence*. His suffering therefore has irreplaceable and unique significance.⁴³⁰

Why do Juel and Hengel assume that a presentation of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer figure in the gospels would be antithetical to his messiahship, rather than regarding it as one that informs and fills out their portrayal of Jesus as Messiah? Perhaps they are reacting (implicitly) against the arguments, set forth by Ruppert, that the Davidic Righteous Sufferer tradition—which includes Ps 22—by the time of the first century has been “democratized” so that the suffering of David as *king* no longer plays a role in this motif,⁴³¹ or that the Righteous Sufferer tradition had become “dogma” by the time of Jesus.⁴³² Yet neither of Ruppert’s arguments need be accepted in order to identify certain elements of a Righteous Sufferer tradition in Mark’s narrative of Jesus. These arguments (Juel’s and Hengel’s) represent a more rigid definition of Righteous Sufferer traditions to the other extreme.

Several objections can be raised in response to the rigid distinctions between Jesus dying as a Righteous Sufferer and as the Messiah/king of the Jews advocated by Hengel and Juel. First, it is apparent that at least at some point, the two were not regarded as antithetical. This is evidenced by the eventual attribution of Ps 22 to the paradigmatic king of Israel, David, in the title of the psalm, which is clearly a combination of both Righteous Sufferer and royal elements.

Second, Mark does not engage in pitting one motif or role of Jesus’ identity against the others. As we have mentioned above, there are many other facets to Jesus’ identity besides that of a Righteous Sufferer. I am not arguing that the *primary* description of Jesus should be as a Righteous Sufferer, but that this is one of many which apply to him (and is one that contributes greatly toward an understanding of

⁴³⁰ Martin Hengel, *The Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1981), 40-41. Hoffman, “Psalm 22 (LXX 21),” 26, also adopts Hengel’s view.

⁴³¹ Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*, 32-39. Ahearne-Kroll, “Suffering of David,” 20-21, explicitly raises this objection.

⁴³² Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*, 28.

his use of Ps 22 in his PRN).⁴³³ All of these can be allowed to contribute to a fuller presentation of Jesus as Messiah, rather than being considered competition.

Third, in Mark's gospel there is not a complete separation between Jesus' role as Messiah and Jesus' role as the exemplar for his disciples. In other words, the Markan themes of Christology and discipleship are presented in dialectical relationship. Therefore, Jesus' uniqueness, bound up in his messiahship, should not be pushed as far as Hengel might want. Jesus is still an example for his followers, even as he functions as the Christ. Perhaps the clearest instance of this dialectical relationship between Christology and discipleship can be found in the passages immediately following Jesus' passion-resurrection predictions (Mark 8:34-38; 9:35; 10:38). In each of these passages, Jesus sets forth a pattern of discipleship for his followers based on the experiences he has just predicted for himself. Yet these passion-resurrection predictions are some of the clearest Markan examples of what it means for Jesus to be the Christ.⁴³⁴ Thus, it is clear that in Mark we find a combination of claims of Jesus' uniqueness as Messiah, with an emphasis on his function as exemplar for his followers.

Fourth, it does seem to be significant that at the climactic moment of his death, Jesus is presented as a Righteous Sufferer. In fact, this is precisely what Mark has prepared his readers to expect: that Jesus' fate as Messiah involves—and is (re)defined by—his suffering! Thus, on the one hand, Hengel is correct to note the integration of the Righteous Sufferer elements with Jesus' portrayal as Messiah, but *contra* Hengel, this does not require that the former be completely subsumed under the latter such that it becomes meaningless to talk about Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer figure. There is room enough in Mark for a robust and multifaceted portrayal of Jesus' identity which includes the motif of the Righteous Sufferer.

⁴³³ Bayer, *Predictions*, 241-242, also sees the Righteous Sufferer motif as one of many "themes" which contribute to the portrayal of Jesus' future as presented in the passion-resurrection predictions of Mark.

⁴³⁴ This is made clear by the location of the first passion-resurrection prediction, which comes immediately after Peter's confession of Jesus as the Christ (Mark 8:29).

The Righteous Sufferer in Mark's Passion-Resurrection Narrative

In his article on the genre and function of the Markan PRN, G. Nickelsburg argues that its genre is based upon a generic model in Jewish literature of stories that contain the theme of the rescue and vindication of the righteous one.⁴³⁵ It is “shaped after the genre found in Genesis 34-45, Esther, Daniel 3 and 6, 2 Maccabees 7, and Wisdom of Solomon 2 and 5; and it is enhanced by details that reflect haggadic exegesis of the canonical Psalms about the persecution and vindication of the righteous one.”⁴³⁶ He lays out the elements of this genre, some of which are most often found in a recognizable sequence: introduction, provocation, conspiracy, decision, trust, obedience, accusation, trial, condemnation, protest, prayer, assistance, ordeal, reactions, and rescue; and others that are found in various sequences depending on the narrative: vindication, exaltation, investiture, acclamation, reactions, and punishment.⁴³⁷ He sees the Markan PRN as having this same “literary shape,” containing many of the components of this genre, beginning in Mark 11:15-17 with the provocation⁴³⁸ and ending with acclamation—in the centurion’s confession of 15:39.⁴³⁹

Why regard these elements as parts of a genre, rather than being merely individual points of contact with prior stories of Righteous Sufferers? Mark gives his readers several indications throughout his gospel that he identifies Jesus as one who fits the type of the Righteous Sufferer. For example, the formal passion-resurrection predictions in Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34 foreshadow the conspiracy that is made explicit in Mark 11:18 and prepare the implied reader for the events that will take place in this plot. It would therefore come as no surprise to the reader (in contrast with the disciples who misunderstand his identity: Mark 8:32; 9:32; 10:35-45) when these events are narrated in Mark 14 and 15. Other elements of the motif found in

⁴³⁵ See Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, for a more detailed discussion of the presence of this motif in Second Temple Judaism; and George W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Genre and Function of the Markan Passion Narrative,” *HTR* 73 (1980): 153-84, for his attribution of this model to Mark’s passion narrative.

⁴³⁶ Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism*, 111.

⁴³⁷ Summarized in Nickelsburg, “Genre,” 157-63.

⁴³⁸ Nickelsburg, “Genre,” 164, sees Jesus’ attitude toward the temple as the thing that provokes the *conspiracy* in Mark 11:18.

⁴³⁹ He regards Jesus’ citation of Ps 22:2, within its broader context, as constituting a *prayer* for deliverance, similar to that of Susanna; cf. Sus 42-44, where she cries out “with a loud voice” and is heard by the Lord.

both the formal passion-resurrection predictions and the other passages which foreshadow the coming events of Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection include: provocation (Jesus tells a parable against the Jewish authorities, Mark 12:12), conspiracy (the betrayal of Jesus to the Jewish authorities and their subsequent rejection of him, Mark 9:31; 10:33; 8:31; 12:12), decision (Mark 14:36), trust (Jesus knows that he will be vindicated by God, Mark 8:31; 9:9; 9:31; 10:34; 12:10-11; 14:25; 14:28), prayer (Mark 14:35-39), obedience (Mark 14:36), condemnation (Mark 10:33), protest (Jesus is portrayed as one who innocently does the will of his Father, Mark 12:6), vindication and/or exaltation (Mark 8:31; 9:9; 9:31; 10:34; 12:10-11; 14:25; 14:28; 14:62), acclamation (of Jesus' exalted status, Mark 12:11; and perhaps implicitly in the announcement of the young man at the tomb, Mark 16:6⁴⁴⁰), and punishment (of the antagonists, Mark 12:9).

Thus, Mark equips his implied readers throughout the larger narrative with the categories and the information needed to interpret the events he will narrate in the PRN concerning his protagonist, Jesus. It is clear that many of the elements of the motif are present in the narrative even before the PRN proper, a fact which is neglected by Nickelsburg due to his focus on the passion narrative alone as an entirely separate genre from the rest of the gospel. However, it must be underscored that the readers are not only prepared to anticipate the components of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer presented in the PRN, but come across many of these elements prior to Mark's narration of the actual events. This highlights the important, rather the necessary, part which the larger narrative plays in guiding the readers' understanding of the later events that take place as a result of Jesus' identity as a Righteous Sufferer. To ignore this role of the larger narrative is to miss the interplay between this wider narrative and the PRN, and results in a suffering righteous Jesus whose portrayal is limited to only a fraction of the entire narrative, and is thus a figure that is merely a shadow of the one Mark actually presents.

Given Nickelsburg's identification of the tearing of the temple veil as the generic element of vindication, and the centurion's confession as the acclamation of the narrative, on the surface it appears that he leaves little room for the resurrection account of Mark 16:1-8 to be considered as part of the motif of the Righteous

⁴⁴⁰ See below.

Sufferer in the gospel.⁴⁴¹ Perhaps this is due to his location of the Righteous Sufferer plot mainly within the passion account itself. Yet the plot of the formal passion-resurrection predictions and the other passages examined in this chapter indicates that Jesus' *resurrection/exaltation* will constitute his vindication. Thus, Nickelsburg's schema needs some important nuancing. I argue that the plot of the Righteous Sufferer extends beyond the passion proper into the resurrection account, highlighting the continuity of the two. They constitute two portions of the plot of the Righteous Sufferer, similar in form to the outline of Ps 22, where the first portion recounts the sufferings of the protagonist (22:1-20), while the second addresses his vindication (22:21-31). Thus, the primary vindication does not take place in the tearing of the temple veil (Mark 15:38), but in Jesus' resurrection from the dead announced in Mark 16:4-7.⁴⁴²

In fact, Nickelsburg does indeed recognize that vindication comes in the form of Jesus' resurrection and exaltation.⁴⁴³ He sees the account of the tearing of the veil and the confession of the centurion functioning as evidence of his vindication in their acknowledgement that it is actually Jesus' obedience in accepting death that is vindicated. This follows the pattern of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer, where the protagonist is rescued *from* death and it is his/her obedience in the face of death and/or in accepting death that is vindicated.⁴⁴⁴ Yet this is not the robust vindication which Mark has prepared his readers to expect all along. Neither is it the type of vindication which the psalmist celebrates in the congregation. The full and

⁴⁴¹ Nickelsburg, "Genre," 165. Davis, "Paradox," 3-18, also argues that Mark 15:39 is the christological climax of Mark's gospel, which is connected with his view of the resurrection account in 16:1-8 as "the joyless discovery of the empty tomb" (5).

⁴⁴² Besides the statement of the centurion in Mark 15:39, there does not appear to be any other explicit element of acclamation within Mark's PRN. Several conclusions can be drawn from this: (1) the usual order of vindication followed by acclamation has been altered by Mark, so that the centurion's statement is to be understood as a comment upon Jesus' vindication via resurrection which has yet to be narrated (an anticipation of sorts); (2) there is no true acclamation element in the Markan account (the centurion's statement might in this case be regarded as a declaration of Jesus' innocence); (3) the statement of the young man at the tomb (Mark 16:6) is an implicit acclamation; or (4) Mark's implied readers are meant to supply this element of acclamation in their own worship of the resurrected Jesus. If the best choice is the first option, then there might be a further parallel with the Righteous Sufferer motif in the acclamation being uttered by an opponent (see Dan 3:28-30). It is also possible that there is ironic acclamation from the mockers around the cross in Mark 15:32, although this is not the type of acclamation that Nickelsburg has in mind in his discussion of these elements of the motif.

⁴⁴³ Nickelsburg, "Genre," 183.

⁴⁴⁴ Nickelsburg, "Genre," 175.

anticipated vindication of Jesus comes in his resurrection from the dead, which is proclaimed to the reader in Mark 16:6. Thus we can speak of two aspects of vindication in Mark, the latter being the most emphasized and clearly the most anticipated of the two: (1) God's vindication of Jesus' obedience in accepting his own death (evidenced by God's act of tearing the temple veil and the recognition of the centurion of Jesus' obedience to death as an indication of his status as God's son); (2) a vindication which takes the form of Jesus' resurrection and exaltation.

According to Mark, this Righteous Sufferer's vindication comes only *after* his suffering and death (note the repetition of the formula in the formal passion-resurrection predictions: suffering, rejection, death, and resurrection; Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34), rather than him being saved *from* death, which is the experience of most of the previous Righteous Sufferers in Jewish literature (e.g., Daniel, Joseph, and Susanna), although this is not a necessary component of these stories (e.g., 2 Macc 7). This connotes a significant modification of the normal plot line of the motif. For those readers familiar with the motif, the type of vindication which they have been prepared by the narrative to expect on behalf of Jesus, i.e., resurrection from the dead, would have appeared even more spectacular than if Jesus had merely been rescued *from* death like those Righteous Sufferers who had gone before him. Thus, the ultimate Righteous Sufferer will receive the ultimately unique vindication by God! By presenting his Jesus as the Righteous Sufferer in a long line of many who have gone before him, Mark underscores both continuity and discontinuity between the two. The Markan adoption and adaptation of this motif, especially in the very distinctive nature of the vindication that *this* Righteous Sufferer will experience (resurrection) is yet another indication of the importance of the resurrection in his overall narrative.

The same order of events predicted throughout Mark's narrative and recounted in his PRN (suffering → death → resurrection/vindication) fits the overall schema of the stories which concern the persecution and vindication of God's Righteous Sufferer(s) throughout the scriptures and extra-canonical literature. Although Nickelsburg does not discuss the Righteous Sufferer types found in the psalms in his category of the "stories of persecution and vindication in Jewish

literature,”⁴⁴⁵ I argue that Mark’s use of the motif also corresponds closely to the experience of the Righteous Sufferer in Ps 22. This psalm also contains many of the Righteous Sufferer elements common to the motif: conspiracy (the psalmist is persecuted and mocked by his enemies, Ps 22:8-9, 13-14), trust (the psalmist reaffirms the trust that he and his descendants have had in God, Ps 22:4-6, 10-11, 20-22), condemnation (the enemies follow through with their threats of persecution, Ps 22:17-19), protest (the psalmist cries out to God in his misery, Ps 22:2), prayer (the entire psalm can be seen as a prayer of lament and thanksgiving to God, Ps 22:2-32), assistance (God answers the psalmist, Ps 22:22), rescue and vindication (God delivers the psalmist from his enemies, Ps 22:22, 25, 32), and reactions (the rescue of the psalmist will be proclaimed in the assembly, and God’s deed will result in his worship from the ends of the earth, Ps 22:26-28, 30-32).⁴⁴⁶

Given the shared plot of this Righteous Sufferer literature and Mark’s presentation of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer, it comes as no surprise that multiple allusions to Ps 22 are sprinkled throughout the Markan narrative of Jesus’ crucifixion. In addition, Jesus’ citation in Mark 15:34, within the context of both Ps 22 and the Markan narrative, contributes to this shared motif of the rescue and vindication of the righteous one, thus contributing to the identification of Jesus as the Markan Righteous Sufferer.

LXX Ps 21: A Psalm of the Righteous Sufferer?

Among those scholars who concern themselves with the issue of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer, there are some who deny that the speaker of LXX Ps 21 is one such righteous person. Based on the assumption that Mark makes use of LXX Ps 21 as the resource for his citation and allusions in chapter 15 of the gospel, these

⁴⁴⁵ This is due to his preference for comparing the stories (narratives) of the Righteous Sufferer with Mark’s PRN, rather than the types of the Righteous Sufferer found in the wisdom literature (although he does mention Wis 2 and 4—5); Nickelsburg, “Genre,” 155-56.

⁴⁴⁶ Others who see in Ps 22 the “plot” of the Righteous Sufferer include: Gese, “Psalm 22,” 180-201; and Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*. Moo, *Old Testament*, 293, has expressed caution against equating the concept of the Righteous Sufferer in the psalms with the concept found in the extra-canonical martyr narratives. Yet Nickelsburg has taken great care to show that there are still shared elements and that it can be regarded as a cohesive tradition. The relationship between the martyr passages and the lament psalms (the former clearly use the latter) suggests that there is sufficient continuity between the two. It is possible to acknowledge this continuity without ignoring the differences as well.

scholars conclude that the category of Righteous Sufferer is not an appropriate way in which to understand how Mark is presenting his Jesus in his PRN, precisely because the psalmist would not have been considered a righteous man in the first place. The doubts raised by these scholars manifest themselves in two main levels of argumentation: (1) that it is inappropriate to include this psalm in the category of the Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer; and (2) therefore the presence of Mark's apparent use of LXX Ps 21:2 for his citation indicates that Jesus is not presented as his Righteous Sufferer. Each of these will be discussed and challenged below.

On the basis of μακράν ἀπὸ τῆς σωτηρίας μου οἱ λόγοι τῶν παραπτωμάτων μου (“my trespasses”) in LXX Ps 21:2, Hoffman argues that Ps 22 was not necessarily understood as a psalm about a righteous man, and therefore urges against the labeling of this person as a “*righteous* sufferer.”⁴⁴⁷ He goes even further than this, however, in arguing that the mention of these sins of the psalmist serves to indicate the reason he is being abandoned by God (Ps 21:2a) in the first place.⁴⁴⁸ However, as Hoffman admits, in the only other passage of scripture which states that God actually did abandon someone, the abandonment by God does not indicate a sin on the part of the individual, but rather is done to test him and his motivations (Hezekiah, 2 Chr 32:31).⁴⁴⁹ The lack of any other evidence in the psalm indicating that the speaker's sins have as a consequence brought on the abandonment of God shows that this connection should not be assumed.⁴⁵⁰

Similarly, in his recent dissertation on the four Davidic “Psalms of Individual Lament” in Mark's gospel, Ahearne-Kroll challenges the argument that the Righteous Sufferer is an appropriate category with which to interpret LXX Ps 21,

⁴⁴⁷ This is somewhat perplexing considering the apparent concessions he makes later in his study, Hoffman, “Psalm 22 (LXX 21),” 293-95. In the context of his discussion of the relationship between Wis 2—5 and Ps 22, Hoffman concedes that, due to its labelling of the protagonist as a “righteous one” while simultaneously using Ps 22 as an intertext, “. . . it is understandable for the author of the Wisdom of Solomon reasonably to suppose that such titles could be appropriately applied to the psalmist” (295). However, this seems to go against everything he has said about the psalmist of Ps 22 not being righteous on the basis of LXX Ps 21:2!

⁴⁴⁸ Cf. Hoffman, “Psalm 22 (LXX 21),” 113; along with Harvey D. Lange, “A Study of the Hermeneutical Principles Involved in the Interpretation and Use of Psalm 22 in Biblical and Extrabiblical Sources” (Ph.D. diss., Concordia Seminary, 1970), 39.

⁴⁴⁹ Conversely, when God does not abandon someone it is not necessarily due to their lack of sin, but rather God's mercy or because he has chosen them (e.g. Ps 38:22; Gen 28:15; 1 Chr 28:20; Josh 1:5).

⁴⁵⁰ And has dangerous consequences when applied to the person of Jesus, as Hoffman rightly notes.

and consequently, to understand the identity of the Markan Jesus.⁴⁵¹ He, too, highlights the mention of the psalmist's sins in LXX Ps 21:2c, and, while arguing that Mark's citation is derived from the LXX version, concludes that this leaves no room for either speaker to be portrayed as a Righteous Sufferer.⁴⁵²

Although on the surface it might appear that Hoffman and Ahearne-Kroll's arguments against interpreting the Markan Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer on the basis of Mark's apparent use of LXX Ps 21:2 carry significant weight, they are rife with assumptions that cannot be supported by the evidence required. It is possible to dismiss these arguments very simply, by challenging at least two of their underlying assumptions: (a) their understanding of the meaning of "righteousness" in Jewish literature; and (b) their oversimplified understanding of the textual history of the scriptures.

A fundamental problem with both Hoffman and Ahearne-Kroll's argument is their premise that "righteousness" is equated with "sinlessness" in the scriptures. Both scholars are working with a definition of "righteousness" which assumes that one cannot be truly righteous if one has ever sinned. This does not come from the Jewish notion of the word as indicated in the scriptures or extra-canonical literature, but rather stems from a post-Reformation Protestant view of sin. Thus, their definition of "righteous" or "righteousness" is anachronistic, and lacks evidence from the scriptural texts themselves. E. P. Sanders has argued quite extensively against the type of definition of "righteousness" with which Hoffman and Ahearne-Kroll are working. In his book on Judaism around the time of Paul, one of Sanders' aims is to refute the incorrect notion that Jews believed that a sinless life was required in order to be righteous.⁴⁵³ Instead, those who are righteous strive to obey the Torah, even though they fail to obey it perfectly: "... the general view was that the righteous man was not characterized by perfection. . . but by the earnest endeavour to obey the law

⁴⁵¹ Ahearne-Kroll, "Suffering of David," 18-19. He responds specifically to the thesis of Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*. Ahearne-Kroll's argument against regarding the Righteous Sufferer as a fitting category in which to interpret LXX Ps 21 and the Markan Jesus, appears to be directly influenced by his larger thesis that Jesus is depicted here as a *suffering David*. However, this relies too heavily on an association of the psalm with David which comes in a later addition (the title), and is too narrow (would not the Righteous Sufferer motif be capable of encompassing a Davidic sufferer?).

⁴⁵² See Ahearne-Kroll, "Suffering of David," 125 and 283-292.

⁴⁵³ E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1977).

and by repentance and other acts of atonement in the case of transgression.”⁴⁵⁴ Thus, it is clear that, *contra* Hoffman and Ahearne-Kroll, the opposite of “righteousness” is not “sinfulness” but “rebelliousness,” i.e., a refusal to follow the commands of God. The righteous one, then, is one who is faithful to God and his covenant and takes the appropriate action in response to his/her sin.⁴⁵⁵ It is also important to note that one’s “righteousness” was to some extent relative. The faithful were righteous when compared to those who were unfaithful, i.e., the wicked.⁴⁵⁶ When compared to God, however, no one was deemed righteous.⁴⁵⁷ Thus, even the righteous were deemed so only because of God’s grace.⁴⁵⁸

The psalms contain perhaps the clearest scriptural examples of what it means to be righteous. Several psalms simultaneously contain declarations of the sinfulness of the speaker as well as his righteousness. In Ps 7:9-12 the speaker is described as one who is righteous (צַדִּיק) and has integrity (יָם), yet in the following verses (7:13-17) acknowledges his need for repentance, as he would otherwise be like the wicked who are his enemies. Psalm 19:13-15 indicates that having sinned in the past does not prohibit one from being rendered blameless (תָּמִים) by God. Psalm 31:11 speaks of the psalmist’s iniquity (עֲוֹן), while 31:18-19 contrasts him with the wicked and includes him in the company of the righteous. In Ps 32:1-5 the psalmist speaks extensively of his own sin (פֶּשַׁע, עֲוֹן), but in 32:10-11 contrasts those who confess their sins (which includes him) with the wicked and calls those who confess their sins “righteous ones” (צַדִּיקִים).

Many psalms contrast the ways of the wicked, who are seated in rebellion from God, and the ways of the righteous. In Ps 10:8 the wicked persecute and kill the “innocent” (יָקִי). Throughout the psalm the wicked person is equated with the one who rejects God, while the innocent/afflicted are those who turn to God for deliverance. At several points in Ps 18 the speaker refers to himself as blameless

⁴⁵⁴ Sanders, *Paul*, 203. He later gives examples from *Pss. Sol.* 3:8; 9:6-7 (399).

⁴⁵⁵ Sanders, *Paul*, 205.

⁴⁵⁶ E.g., Sir 21:1, 9-10.

⁴⁵⁷ Sanders, *Paul*, 278. E.g., 1QS XI, 11-12; 1QH XII, 29-31.

⁴⁵⁸ See Sanders, *Paul*, 294, 305-312, 421. He cites examples from Qumran literature, such as 1QH XV, 28-30 and 1QH XVII, 14-15.

(תמים, 18:24, 26) in comparison with the wicked. Psalm 34:16-23 contrasts the righteous with wicked/evildoers, as does Ps 37.⁴⁵⁹

Psalm 18 defines righteousness as following God and keeping his commandments, rather than willfully departing from him. This is evident in Ps 18:21-25 where the contrast to righteousness is to act wickedly (רשעתי, 18:22) toward God.

Some psalms highlight the disparity between the speaker's righteousness, which is a gift from God, and God's righteousness. An example of this is Ps 18:31-33, which affirms that only God is truly blameless and that he is the one to be credited with the psalmist's blamelessness.

Considering the evidence presented above, it becomes obvious upon reflection that *any* language adopted by Mark that originally expressed the experience of another Righteous Sufferer who had gone on before Jesus would naturally fall short. This is because no Righteous Sufferer in Jewish history would have been regarded as completely sinless, i.e., genuinely and thoroughly righteous *like God*! Sinlessness was not regarded as a prerequisite for righteousness. Many of the Righteous Sufferers of Jewish literature were still presented with flaws.⁴⁶⁰ This is in contrast to the Markan Jesus, who, although never explicitly labelled as "righteous"⁴⁶¹ in the narrative, nevertheless is presented as one who is completely in the will of God, and, as mentioned above, is not compromised by sin in any way. This Jesus, as the ultimate Righteous Sufferer, far surpasses other Righteous Sufferers in his closeness to God (e.g. Mark 1:1; 1:11; 15:39) and in the form of his vindication (in resurrection *after* death, not rescue *from* death). Thus, although all previous language concerning the Righteous Sufferers of Israel would invariably be lacking in some sense, this does not mean that it is entirely insufficient as a vehicle

⁴⁵⁹ We have seen that the Qumran community used this psalm to describe the contrast between themselves (the righteous) and those who opposed them (the wicked) in 4QPs^a.

⁴⁶⁰ Hoffman, "Psalm 22 (LXX 21)," 316, makes much of the rabbinic perception of Esther (Esther is regarded as the speaker of Ps 22 in rabbinic literature: cf. *Midr. Pss*) as flawed, so much so that he concludes that she is far from a Righteous Sufferer figure, which supports his argument against a cohesive tradition of the Righteous Sufferer at the time of the gospels. However, three points may call for caution in adopting Hoffman's position here: (1) Esther is sometimes called "righteous" in rabbinic literature (*b. Meg.* 13a; *Midr. Pss* 22.3); (2) this literature appears significantly later than the gospel of Mark; and (3) the equation of a person being "flawed" and thus "unrighteous" is an anachronistic definition of what it means to be righteous (see above).

⁴⁶¹ It is the other gospels who speak of Jesus explicitly as "righteous" (Matt 27:19; Luke 23:47; John 5:30).

used to illumine the person of the Markan Jesus both by comparison and contrast!⁴⁶² This study has already highlighted in detail the multiple ways that Mark strives to portray Jesus as his Righteous Sufferer, both by presenting his life, death, and resurrection in such a way as to follow the plot of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer, by presenting him as one surrounded by persecutors, and by stressing the vindication he will received via resurrection upon the completion of his obedience in death.

The argument of Hoffman and Ahearne-Kroll—that Mark is citing LXX Ps 21:2, and therefore cannot be referring to Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer on the basis of the psalmist’s sins—should be rejected for another reason. Their argument rests on a problematic oversimplification of the state of scriptural texts at the time of Mark’s gospel.⁴⁶³ Contrary to the assumptions of these scholars, in the first century the total number of options for a scriptural intertext used by a Jew or Christian was not simply the LXX or the MT. These are anachronistic terms. The final forms of the LXX and MT did not appear until the second century CE and the ninth-twelfth century CE, respectively, well after the writing of Mark’s gospel.⁴⁶⁴ The discoveries at Qumran of variant Hebrew and Greek texts confirmed what many scholars had already suspected: there was a variety of versions of the scriptures during the first century, some of which eventually became what we would now consider the MT (proto-Masoretic) and the LXX (Old Greek). The textual evidence points to the fact that the MT does not reflect the “original” text of the scriptures, and to simply speak of *the*

⁴⁶² It should also be noted that figures who corresponded to a certain “type” were not expected to be identical to that former figure. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 351-352, is helpful here: “For in so far as the ‘later correspondents’ occur in history and time, they will never be precisely identical with their prototype, but inevitably stand in a *hermeneutical* relationship with them. The reasons for this are twofold. On the one hand, while it is in the nature of typologies to emphasize the homological ‘likeness’ of any two events, the concrete historicity of the correlated data means that no new event is ever merely a ‘type’ of another, but always retains its historically unique character. Moreover, and this is the second factor, nexuses between distinct temporal data are never something simply given; they are rather something which must always be exegetically established. Indeed, in the Hebrew Bible such nexuses are the product of a specific mode of theological-historical speculation—one which seeks to adapt, interpret, or otherwise illuminate a present experience (or hope, or expectation) *by means of* an older datum.”

⁴⁶³ See Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd rev. ed; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), which is perhaps the best resource for the issue of the textual history of the scriptures. See also Ralph W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: From the Septuagint to Qumran* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974); and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (eds. P. W. Flint and M. G. Abegg Jr.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

⁴⁶⁴ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 137, 35.

MT before the Middle Ages is not accurate, as it is made up of many textual witnesses which belong to an even larger group of texts which are pre-Masoretic.⁴⁶⁵ The MT as we now have it is only a portion of the textual tradition of pre-Masoretic texts, that tradition which was preserved by Aaron Ben Asher of the Tiberian group of Masoretes.⁴⁶⁶ The four primary groups of texts that we know existed during the first century are: (1) proto-Masoretic; (2) pre-Samaritan (from which emerged the Samaritan Pentateuch); (3) Old Greek (OG); and (4) the Qumran texts which do not appear to be related to the previous three.⁴⁶⁷

From this brief summary of the textual history of the scriptures, it becomes evident that this issue is more complex than is implied by the arguments of Hoffman and Ahearne-Kroll, because the texts that were potentially available to Mark were more diverse than they consider. By using the terms “MT” and “LXX” in such a simplistic manner (making it seem as if these were both fixed and the majority texts by the first century), Hoffman and Ahearne-Kroll fail to appreciate the fluidity and variety of the texts of scripture that were available to both Jews and Christians during the time of Mark’s gospel. A more nuanced and sensitive approach to the issue of Mark’s use of the scriptures is needed, and Hoffman and Ahearne-Kroll’s conclusions concerning the interpretation of the citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 are based on an oversimplification of this matter.

Conclusions

The goal of this chapter has been to argue that the Jesus of Mark’s gospel is indeed presented as a Righteous Sufferer. This has been accomplished by highlighting the presence of narrative indicators of this motif, such as the theme of martyrdom, the function of the passion-resurrection predictions, the (implicit) presentation of Jesus as one who is innocent and righteous, and the function of Jesus as the prototype of his community, and thus the model for discipleship that includes obeying the will of God even in the midst of suffering and possible death. It has also been argued that a presentation of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer is not antithetical to Mark’s portrayal of him as Messiah, but that his identity as the Righteous Sufferer is

⁴⁶⁵ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 11, 27.

⁴⁶⁶ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 77-79.

⁴⁶⁷ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 15, 21.

one of the many contours of his roles as the Christ. Following the schema of Nickelsburg, the elements of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer in Mark's PRN proper have been highlighted and discussed in terms of their function in identifying Jesus as Mark's Righteous Sufferer. Moreover, it has been demonstrated that Mark does indeed present Jesus throughout his PRN and specifically in his use of Ps 22 as the ultimate Righteous Sufferer. All of these conclusions support the legitimacy of using the category of the Righteous Sufferer to understand the person of Jesus in Mark's gospel.

Chapter 7

The Meaning and Function of Ps 22 in Mark's Passion-Resurrection Narrative

I now turn to the crux of this study: What is the meaning and function of Ps 22 in Mark's PRN, especially Jesus' citation of Ps 22:2 from the cross? There are many issues concerning this question that must be addressed and examined, and each must be weighed for its value in answering this overarching query. As I have noted thus far, there are several independent strands of evidence that suggest that Mark's implied readers would have understood this citation in its context as one that is informed by the whole of Ps 22 rather than merely the first verse. In Chapter 3, I highlighted Mark's concern to present Jesus as one who will not only suffer and die, but will experience God's vindication via resurrection, thus preparing the implied reader to expect something beyond the cross. Chapter 4 dealt with the way Mark uses the scriptures throughout his gospel, observing that he often does not cite verses atomistically, but rather contextually, indicating in the surrounding narrative context that the larger scriptural context is in view. Chapter 5 was concerned with elements of Mark's (and his implied readers') socio-cultural milieu that strengthen the likelihood that Mark 15:34 was read and heard in the way I have argued throughout this study. Chapter 6 highlighted the presence of the motif of the Righteous Sufferer in Mark's gospel, as it is applied to Jesus; a motif which is also present in Ps 22. In this chapter I will propose that another (and, in fact, the key) strand of evidence that Mark 15:34 is not cited atomistically, nor would have been understood by Mark's implied readers in this way, is found in Mark's use of Ps 22 in the larger passion-resurrection account. This is apparent in the multiple allusions to the psalm in Mark 15, and also in the surrounding context of Mark 15:34 itself.

In the first section of the chapter I will examine the allusions to Ps 22 sprinkled throughout Mark 15. I will also suggest additional examples of possible allusions to the psalm outside of the PRN,⁴⁶⁸ especially with regard to the affinities that the psalm has with Mark's presentation of Jesus as his Righteous Sufferer. The

⁴⁶⁸ Perhaps the term "echo" might here be a more appropriate descriptor, since these tend to be less clear than the other allusions found in Mark 15. See Hays, *Echoes*, for his ground-breaking (at least in the realm of biblical studies) discussion of intertextual echoes.

second section of the chapter will deal specifically with Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34. This will include a close reading of this passage, with particular emphasis on text-critical issues, the meaning and purpose of the Aramaic phrase, some interaction with previous scholarly interpretations of this passage, and, finally, a proposed interpretation of Mark 15:34 based on a narrative reading of the Markan PRN with a view toward an understanding of the passage through the eyes of Mark's implied readers.

Strong Allusions to Ps 22 in Mark's Passion-Resurrection Narrative

The case for reading the context of the entire psalm in Mark's passion-resurrection narrative with regard to the person of Jesus does not solely rely on whether one believes Mark 15:34 to be an incipit.⁴⁶⁹ Even if one does not consider an incipit reading of Jesus' lament alone as a sufficient basis for interpreting it contextually, the fact that Mark sprinkles his passion-resurrection narrative with various allusions to the psalm further points the reader in that direction.

As has been argued previously, Ps 22 is one of several "Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer" which provide the largest source of scriptural allusions and citations for the gospel writers in general, and Mark in particular.⁴⁷⁰ These psalms contain a portrayal of a person who laments the unjust persecution he suffers at the hands of his enemies, proclaims his innocence, and calls upon the Lord to deliver him from his sufferings.⁴⁷¹ There are echoes of these psalms throughout the PRN of Mark, beginning with the very first verse of Mark 14.⁴⁷² In fact, Ps 22 provides more allusions than any other psalm in this category.⁴⁷³

It is clear that Mark makes great use of Ps 22 throughout his crucifixion account. Even before the direct citation from Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34, the reader encounters several allusions to the psalm in his narrative of the treatment of Jesus,

⁴⁶⁹ See the discussion of incipits in Chapter 5.

⁴⁷⁰ Marcus, *Way*, 172. See Mark 14:1 (Ps 10:7-8), 14:18 (Ps 41:9), 14:34 (Ps 42:5, 11; 43:5), 14:41 (Ps 140:8), 14:55 (Ps 37:32), 14:57 (Ps 27:12; 35:11), 14:61 and 15:4-5 (Ps 35:13-15), 15:24 (Ps 22:18); 15:29 (Ps 22:7); 15:30-31 (Ps 22:8); 15:32 (Ps 22:6), 15:34 (Ps 22:1), 15:36 (Ps 69:21), and 15:40 (Ps 38:11).

⁴⁷¹ Marcus, *Way*, 172.

⁴⁷² δόλος, the cunning of an enemy, is a frequent motif in these psalms—cf. Pss 10:7; 35:20; 36:3; 52:2; 55:11.

⁴⁷³ Mark 15:24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 39. Perhaps also Mark 9:12; 15:27, 43; 16:6, 7.

both immediately before and during his placement on the cross. Most of the allusions to Ps 22 (and others in this gospel) are subtle and implicit, and would have been recognized only by those familiar with Ps 22. In an illuminating essay on the use of scripture in the book of Hebrews, Luke Timothy Johnson recognizes the impact of allusions in their resultant location of the reader in the same “world” as the author (which, for Mark, is the world of the scriptures):

The power of . . . allusion and echo is possibly even stronger than that of direct citation, precisely because scripture's language is not bracketed off as something 'other' but is appropriated as the author's own language without explanation or apology. And if author and reader (or speaker and hearer) all understand the diction of scripture and catch every subtle textual allusion, then surely they dwell within the same scriptural world.⁴⁷⁴

The worlds of Mark and of his implied readers, then, become one world—a world informed and colored by the scriptures—in the readers’ recognition of the psalmic allusions scattered throughout the crucifixion account; and this ability to recognize these, then, becomes a kind of identification-marker for both parties. The impact of these allusions upon Mark’s implied readers in their understanding of Jesus’ passion-resurrection experience would therefore have been quite profound. Their recognition of this “inside language” would have helped to highlight the importance of the presence and function of these allusions in Mark’s PRN.

⁴⁷⁴ Luke Timothy Johnson, “The Scriptural World of Hebrews,” *Int* 57 (2003): 241. In the case of Mark, this familiarity might have been fostered by the early Christian community’s use of the psalms in worship, stemming from their usage in temple and synagogue worship. See Joel Marcus, “The Old Testament and the Death of Jesus: The Role of Scripture in the Gospel Passion Narratives,” in *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity* (by J. T. Carroll and J. B. Green; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995), 209, and my discussion in Chapter 5 of this study.

The clearest allusions to Ps 22 appear in Mark 15:24, 29, 30, 31, and 32. Note how Mark’s wording resembles that of the LXX Ps 21, which belongs to a uniform tradition along with the MT Ps 22:

Mark 15:24b	. . . καὶ διαμερίζονται τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλῆρον ἐπ’ αὐτὰ τίς τί ἄρη.	Ps 21:19	<i>Διμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου εἰς αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον.</i>
Mark 15:29	. . . <i>κινούντες τὰς κεφαλὰς</i> αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες,	Ps 21:8	Πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντές με ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με, ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν, <i>ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν</i> . . .
Mark 15:30	<i>σῶσον σεαυτὸν</i> καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ.	Ps 21:9	ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ Κύριον, ῥυσάσθω αὐτόν, <i>σωσάτω αὐτόν</i> , ὅτι θέλει αὐτόν.
Mark 15:31b	ἄλλους <i>ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν</i> οὐ δύναται σῶσαι.	Ps 21:9	ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ Κύριον, ῥυσάσθω αὐτόν, <i>σωσάτω αὐτόν</i> , ὅτι θέλει αὐτόν.
Mark 15:32b	καὶ οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι σὺν αὐτῷ <i>ὠνειδίζον</i> αὐτόν.	Ps 21:7	. . . καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, <i>ὄνειδος</i> ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐξουθένημα λαοῦ.

In Mark 15:24, the author presents the soldiers, after crucifying Jesus, as casting lots to divide up his clothing.⁴⁷⁵ In the same way, Ps 22:19 contains the speaker’s lament that his enemies (those “dogs” and “those who do evil”) who surround him are dividing up his clothing amongst themselves and are casting lots for it, perhaps in the anticipation—which is premature in the case of the psalm—that he will die. Mark also recounts the passers-by shaking their heads in 15:29, which shares the vocabulary of Ps 22:8 (*ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν*, שֹׂקֵי יְהוָה) and also presents his protagonist, Jesus, as one who experiences similar circumstances of derision at the hands of those around him. Likewise, in Mark 15:30-31, Jesus’ enemies mock him by taunting him with dripping sarcasm to “save himself,” a taunt that is reminiscent of the one that the psalmist experiences at the hands of his enemies in Ps 22:9, which is spawned by their disbelief that God does indeed “want” him (θέλει αὐτόν, רָצָה יְהוָה)

⁴⁷⁵ This is the only allusion to Ps 22 found in all four gospel accounts of Jesus’ crucifixion (Matt 27:35; Luke 23:34; John 19:24).

or that he (God) will save him from his well-deserved fate.⁴⁷⁶ This allusion, like the previous one, is apparent by the linking of vocabulary (σώζω, Niphal of נָצַל) and the shared circumstances in which the psalmist and the Markan Jesus find themselves. The last strong allusion to Ps 22 in the passage is found in the verb “reproach/disgrace” (ὠνειδίζον, from ὠνειδίζω) in Mark 15:32 and the noun which shares the same root in Ps 22:7 (ὀνειδος, חֶרֶף). The former describes the actions of those who were crucified with Jesus. The latter describes the actions of “humanity” (ἀνθρώπου, אָדָם) against the suffering psalmist in the immediate context of the first recounting of the persecutions he is enduring.⁴⁷⁷

All of these allusions help set the scene for the Markan Jesus’ last recorded words to God, the same excruciating cry that the Righteous Sufferer of the psalm utters at the point of his own desperation. Since Mark’s implied readers would most likely have been expected to have some knowledge of the psalms, and therefore to recognize these allusions as belonging to this specific psalm throughout the passion account leading up to the cry of Jesus,⁴⁷⁸ it is not surprising that Mark has chosen a citation from the psalm, which he obviously regards as crucial to interpreting the death of Jesus, as Jesus’ last utterance before his mission is accomplished. Prior to turning our attention to the meaning and function of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34, however, it is necessary to examine the larger Markan narrative to see if there are any other possible allusions to Ps 22 in addition to the clearest ones discussed above.

Fainter Allusions to Ps 22 in Mark’s Larger Narrative

Throughout Mark’s narrative, especially in the first half which concentrates on Jesus’ ministry activities in Galilee and the surrounding regions, Jesus is

⁴⁷⁶ Hoffman, “Psalm 22 (LXX 21),” 346, suggests that Mark might have been the first to link an allusion of Ps 22 with the idea of the Messiah, represented here in this passage in the content of the mockery which taunts Jesus as the Christ (ὁ χριστός) in Mark 15:32.

⁴⁷⁷ The other sections relaying the persecutions of his enemies are found in Ps 22:12-13 and 16-18.

⁴⁷⁸ *Contra* Hoffman, “Psalm 22 (LXX 21),” 347, who argues that there are relatively few allusions to Ps 22 in Mark 15:29-32 which indicates that “Mark is not particularly concerned about being specific in applying Ps 22:7-9 to this scene of Jesus’ crucifixion. In fact, if there were not other evidence to point to Ps 22 (namely, Jesus’ cry in Mark 15:34), it would be easy to dismiss the allusions to Ps 22:7-9 as circumstantial or insignificant.” But how many references to the psalm does he need *in only four verses* in order for him to deem the scripture significant? Surely (at least) three allusions in four verses is adequately dense to regard it as more than “circumstantial,” even without the citation in Mark 15:34!

presented as one who ministers to the poor and the social outcasts. He heals those who are ailing (Mark 1:29-31, 32-39, 40-45; 2:1-12; 3:1-6, 10; 5:25-34; 6:53-56; 7:31-37; 8:22-26; 10:46-52), exorcises demons (1:23-28; 5:1-20; 7:24-30), and raises someone from the dead (5:35-43). Interspersed among these healing accounts in Mark are narratives that demonstrate Jesus' supernatural power, power that has been previously attributed only to God himself (Mark 4:35-41; 6:45-52; and perhaps the provision of bread in the miracles of 6:30-44 and 8:1-10).⁴⁷⁹ Thus, Jesus is presented as, at the very least, one who functions as an agent on behalf of God, carrying out his works for the benefit of God's people, just as God had done throughout Israel's history. Jesus' concern for God's people, especially those who suffer, and his willingness to associate with the despised ones of society (Mark 2:13-17) shares affinities with the psalmist's observation, derived from his personal experience (Ps 22:22b), that God "did not despise or abhor the affliction of the afflicted" (Ps 22:25a), but indeed turns his attention to them and rescues them from their plight (Ps 22:25b, 22b, 27).⁴⁸⁰ It is possible, then, that the Markan Jesus' entire ministry may be informed by an allusion to the compassionate posture of God toward his people as exclaimed by the psalmist in Ps 22. That is, Mark's presentation of Jesus as one concerned for the welfare of the unfortunate is perhaps a loose allusion to the same theme in Ps 22.

Another possible thematic allusion to Ps 22 is found in the accounts of the feeding miracles in Mark 6:30-44 and 8:1-10. Here the poor and hungry who gather to hear Jesus speak are supernaturally provided with bread (and fish). In Ps 22:27, in the midst of the psalmist's praise of God amongst the congregation for his rescue from death, he proclaims that the poor will be provided with food and will be satisfied. Like those mentioned in the psalm, the crowds who are gathered to hear Jesus are not only given a little bread, but are also completely satisfied (as evidenced by the bread that goes uneaten, Mark 6:43; 8:8). Hoffman briefly considers and then dismisses the presence of an allusion to Ps 22:27 in these passages, based on the different vocabulary used (the recipients of the food in Mark are not referred to as "the poor"; LXX's ἐμπλησθήσονται [ἐμπίπλημι]⁴⁸¹ against Mark's ἐχορτάσθησαν

⁴⁷⁹ See Blackburn, *Theios Anēr*, for an in-depth discussion of these miracle traditions.

⁴⁸⁰ עָנִי can also have the sense of "humble" or "poor/needy." The majority of the recipients of Jesus' miracles would have fallen under these categories.

⁴⁸¹ Which follows the MT's עֲנִיִּים (עָנִי).

[χορτάζω)].⁴⁸² On the surface this may seem weighty. However, three points should guard against dismissing the impact of this psalm on these passages based only on the lack of shared vocabulary. First, both verbs ἐμίπλημι and χορτάζω mean essentially the same thing, referring to the notion of being satisfied or filled.⁴⁸³ Second, as I have argued elsewhere in this study, the absence of shared vocabulary should not necessitate a dismissal of a potential allusion, especially in a narrative, since the nature of narrative in containing plot, characters, and setting allows for a more fluid and subtle use of intertexts. Thus, in this case, the shared narrative circumstances of the Markan passages and the psalm (there are poor/needy people who are provided with food from God and are filled) give credence to the claim that there is an allusion to the psalm in the Markan feeding miracles. Third, the presence of virtually indisputable allusions and a citation to Ps 22 elsewhere in the Markan narrative increases the possibility that Ps 22 also serves as an intertext here, whether consciously or subconsciously on the part of the author. Since Ps 22 can be shown to be “in the air” of Mark’s narrative world by other, more clear, passages as well as his reader’s world,⁴⁸⁴ this gives weight to the argument that another allusion to the psalm is located in Mark 6:30-44 and 8:1-10.

In Mark 9:12, Jesus tells Peter, James, and John that he will experience great suffering and will “be treated with contempt.” This word, ἐξουδενηθῆ, is derived from ἐξουδενέω, the root of which is also found in Ps 22:7, and thus probably constitutes an allusion to the psalm.⁴⁸⁵ What is especially striking about this allusion is its presence in the midst of one of Jesus’ statements concerning his suffering and vindication via resurrection from the dead, i.e., one of several places in the Markan narrative where Jesus is presented as one who will experience a similar fate to other righteous sufferers (in suffering and vindication)!⁴⁸⁶ Thus, in this passage, Ps 22 is linked specifically with another concern of Mark: the preparation of his implied readers for his Righteous Sufferer’s imminent resurrection after his suffering and death (Mark 9:9).

⁴⁸² Hoffman, “Psalm 22 (LXX 21),” 384.

⁴⁸³ BDAG, 323-24 and 1087.

⁴⁸⁴ See Chapter 5 of this study.

⁴⁸⁵ So also Collins, “Appropriation,” 234. I arrived at this same conclusion independent of Collins and was confirmed upon encountering her statements here.

⁴⁸⁶ See Chapter 3 of this study.

Although not a predominant theme in Mark's gospel, the issue concerning the role of the Gentiles in Jesus' ministry, and subsequently in God's salvation-plan, is indeed present. This is also an important issue in the thanksgiving portion of Ps 22:22-32, where the psalmist declares (22:28) that the whole world will someday turn back to God (שוב, ἐπιστρέφω), and all the families of the nations will worship him (וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לְפָנָי כָּל-מִשְׁפָּחוֹת גּוֹיִם, προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιόν σου πάσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἔθνων). Perhaps the clearest allusion to this portion of Ps 22 in Mark's narrative can be found in the confession of the centurion in Mark 15:39. Here, at the exact moment of Jesus' death, it is not a faithful Jew who expresses recognition of the impact and import of the event, but rather a Gentile (a Roman soldier, at that!). More will be said about the centurion's statement and its meaning and function in its immediate context later in this chapter, but it should be noted that this is not the only time that Mark deals with the issue of the place of the Gentiles in the kingdom of God, and in their worship of him. Other passages that appear to touch on this shared theme with Ps 22 include Mark 7:24-30 and 11:15-19.

Jesus' interaction with a Syrophenician woman in Mark 7:24-30 addresses this subject. Mark takes great care to highlight the woman's ethnicity as a Gentile and as a Syrophenician (Mark 7:26).⁴⁸⁷ In fact, perhaps Mark takes the narrative (and his readers) out of Galilee⁴⁸⁸ and into the region of Tyre precisely to underscore the "foreignness" of the woman (note that Mark begins the pericope in 7:24 by describing Jesus as "going away," ἀπῆλθεν). At any rate, Jesus is at first reluctant to exorcize the unclean spirit from the woman's daughter, but changes his mind upon her witty retort in Mark 7:28. Rather than getting bogged down in the question concerning what we are to make of the Markan Jesus' initial rejection of her request, what is important for our purposes is that, (1) she proves persistent in her request and in her faith that Jesus has the power to heal her daughter; and (2) in the end Jesus does indeed do so. Thus, here is an instance where Mark presents a Gentile as, (a) sharing in the privileges normally given first to God's chosen people, the Jews; and (b) sharing in (and, in some ways, surpassing!) the insights that are normally expected of Jews. If this passage is indeed part of a larger thematic allusion to Ps

⁴⁸⁷ E.g., C.S. Mann, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27; New York, Doubleday, 1986), 319; Hisako Kinukawa, *Women and Jesus in Mark: A Japanese Feminist Perspective* (Marykoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1994), 51-65.

⁴⁸⁸ In Mark 6:53 he and his disciples are said to be in Γεννησαρὲτ, a region whose location is unknown to scholars. See, for example, Mann, *Mark*, 309.

22:28 in Mark's gospel, it should come as no surprise that the woman is portrayed as "bowing down" (προσέπεσεν, Mark 7:25) at Jesus' feet in a posture of submission (and perhaps even worship).

Another Markan passage which may allude to the theme of Ps 22:28 is found in the presentation of Jesus' temple act in Mark 11:15-19. In the midst of his driving out the buyers, sellers, and moneychangers, Jesus cites a conflation of Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11,

ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; ὑμεῖς δὲ
πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον ληστῶν.

My house shall be called a house of prayer
for all nations;
But you have made it a den of bandits (Mark 11:17).

We have already seen in Chapter 4 that the larger context of Isa 56 addresses the place of the nations in the worship of God. In fact, the larger context of Isa 55-66 presents an offer of salvation to the nations, and indicates an opportunity for them to serve God in the temple, anticipating a transcending of the distinctions between foreigners and God's people.

Ps 22:28 has a concern similar to Isa 56, and by extension, Mark 11:15-19. It too deals with the anticipation of the worship of God by the Gentiles in the future. Thus, although a citation from Isaiah and not from the psalm, the Markan Jesus' words in the temple may have brought to the implied readers' minds additional scriptures that anticipate the Gentiles' inclusion in God's eschatological kingdom. One of these may very well have been Ps 22, and the possibility that this psalm would have been recalled here is increased by Mark's repeated use of it in places elsewhere in the narrative.⁴⁸⁹

⁴⁸⁹ Although it must be noted that, given that Mark's narrative would have been read (and heard) left to right (i.e., from Mark 1:1 → 16:8), it is most likely that his implied readers would have recognized these fainter allusions to Ps 22 only upon the second reading of the gospel, i.e. after they had encountered the clearer allusions to Ps 22 and the citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15.

Fainter Allusions to Ps 22 in Mark's Passion-Resurrection Narrative

Other possible allusions to Ps 22—besides the clear ones of Mark 15:24, 29, 30, 31, and 32—can be found in the midst of the passion-resurrection account itself. Given the nature of these allusions as “faint,” it must be noted that these are tentative suggestions and may not be accepted by many. Fortunately, there are enough clear allusions to Ps 22 throughout Mark's narrative without having to rely on these additional allusions as evidence of the impact of the psalmic intertext on Mark's text.

A faint allusion to Ps 22 may be present in Mark's description of the bandits (ληστές) that are crucified on either side of Jesus in Mark 15:27.⁴⁹⁰ Similarly, in Ps 22:17, the psalmist laments the fact that he is surrounded by those who do evil (πονηρευομένων). Given the prior allusion to Ps 22:19 in Mark 15:24 still ringing in their ears, Mark's implied readers would likely have been attuned to further allusions to the psalm, however faint. Although Mark does not use the same term found in Ps 22:17, the negative connotations bound up in his prior use of ληστής in Mark 11:17 suggest that the two separate terms could be associated with each other, given the right circumstances. These circumstances are present in Mark 15, where Jesus, like the psalmist, experiences persecution at the hands of his enemies—persecution which involves taunting from enemies that surround him. The likelihood that Mark's implied readers made this connection between the psalm and Mark's narrative is strengthened by Luke's concerted effort to draw an even clearer parallel between the circumstances of the psalmist and Jesus by using the same vocabulary as Symmachus' version of Ps 22:17b (κακούργοι, “evil-doers”).⁴⁹¹ In other words, Luke, as an early reader of Mark, here shows how he understood Mark by way of his interpretive adaptation.

A reading of Mark's PRN that takes into account the full context of Ps 22 may also help to explain the reaction of the crowd in Mark 15:35-36. If this reaction is interpreted as a mocking of Jesus, indicated by the crowd's tongue-in-cheek anticipation of a possible deliverance by Elijah and (possibly) the offering of sour

⁴⁹⁰ Frank J. Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics Through Their Passion Stories* (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), 40, lists this passage as an allusion to Ps 22.

⁴⁹¹ Hoffman, “Psalm 22 (LXX 21),” 363, also sees this parallel in Luke. More will be said about Luke's reading/interpretation of Mark's use of Ps 22, and thus his own appropriation of Ps 22 in Chapter 9.

wine in order to prolong his suffering,⁴⁹² it is reminiscent of the scenario in which the plea of the psalmist for this very type of deliverance is found in Ps 22:20-22a:

וְאַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲלֻחֵי לְעֹרְתִי חוֹשֶׁה:²⁰

הַצִּלָּה מִחֶרֶב נַפְשִׁי מִיַּד־כָּלֵב יַחֲדָתִי:²¹

הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי מִפִּי אֲרִיֶּה²²

LXX Psalm 21:20-22: ²⁰ σὺ δέ κύριε μὴ μακρύνῃς τὴν βοήθειάν μου εἰς τὴν
ἀντίλημψίν μου πρόσχες ²¹ ῥῦσαι ἀπὸ ῥομφαίας τὴν ψυχὴν μου καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς
κυνὸς τὴν μονογενῆ μου ²² σῶσόν με ἐκ στόματος λέοντος

But you, O Lord, do not be distant!

O my help, to my assistance make haste!

Rescue my soul from the sword;

my only (soul) from the hand of the dog!

Deliver me from the mouth of the lion!

Given the role of the other passers-by in the Markan account (Mark 15:29-32) and the possible connection between the evil-doers of Ps 22:17 and the crucified bandits surrounding Jesus, it seems plausible that the implied readers are meant to regard the statements of those who misinterpret Jesus' cry in 15:35-36 as insincere and, in fact, mockingly given. Their mocking of Jesus, which on the surface appears to anticipate the coming of Elijah and Jesus' subsequent deliverance, may best be understood in light of these verses from Ps 22.⁴⁹³

⁴⁹² This offering of sour wine is itself an allusion to Ps 69:22, another in the category of the Psalm of the Righteous Sufferer. As I have already noted in Chapter 4, it is not clear from Mark's use of Ps 69:22 in and of itself that the offering of sour wine was meant to be understood as malicious in intent.

⁴⁹³ Robert Holst, "The 'Cry of Dereliction'—Another Point of View," *Springfielder* 35 (1972): 286-87. This is also supported by the possibility that at this time it was often believed that Elijah would be the forerunner of God's coming in the last days (Mal 3:23), although it must be noted that this assertion is debated. This incident is presented in complete contrast with the apparent sincerity of the centurion's statement in Mark 15:39; see my discussion of the nature of the centurion's confession in Chapter 3.

If indeed the readers of the gospel were familiar with Ps 22, it can be presumed that they were aware that, though the psalm begins with lamentation, it ends with the praise of God for his deliverance. In fact, this is a common trajectory in the Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer, although this deliverance is sometimes anticipated in the future, rather than presently being experienced by the individual or community. In the case of Mark's use of Ps 22 in his PRN, this trajectory of the psalm may provide a hint of Jesus' ultimate vindication at his death.⁴⁹⁴ This may very well be reflected in the centurion's confession of Mark 15:39, which is a confession of Jesus' identity as God's son, and in Mark's description of Joseph of Arimathea as one who is looking forward to (προσδεχόμενος) the kingdom of God in 15:43, a kingdom of which the psalmist speaks in Ps 22:26-32, especially in the last four verses of the psalm.⁴⁹⁵ Those who take these verses in Mark as echoes of Ps 22 see similar themes of, (a) the ultimate vindication of God's Righteous Sufferer; and (b) the arrival of the kingdom of God.⁴⁹⁶ In Ps 22, this arrival of God's kingdom is viewed as a future act (22:27-31), whereas Mark indicates that this has begun at the start of Jesus' ministry⁴⁹⁷ and that Jesus' suffering and death play an important role in the inauguration of the kingdom. This may be indicated by his placement of the account of the tearing of the temple veil immediately after Jesus dies in Mark 15:38, his portrayal of the centurion, a representative of "all nations" in 15:39 (Ps 22:28b) as the only one who rightfully confesses him as son of God, and his mention of Joseph of Arimathea, who "finds" what he has been waiting for and acts upon it (15:43).

The final potential allusions to Ps 22 in Mark's narrative are set in the resurrection portion of the PRN. Ps 22:28 speaks of the future worship of God by everyone on the earth, and Ps 22:30 states that even those who have died and been buried will worship God. The psalm then ends by anticipating the proclamation of God and his works (specifically his rescuing of the Righteous Sufferer of the psalm in 22:32) to future generations in Ps 22:31-32. Perhaps the affinities with this portion

⁴⁹⁴ Marcus, "Role," 210. See my more detailed discussion of this in Chapter 3.

⁴⁹⁵ Marcus, "Role," 210, argues that Mark 15:39-43 are allusions to Ps 22, but acknowledges that some regard these as too weak to be certain. Cf. Brown, *Death*, 2:1461; and Schwemer, "Jesu letzte Worte," 11, for an argument to the contrary.

⁴⁹⁶ For example, Gese, "Psalm 22," 180-201; and Marcus, *Way*, 180-82.

⁴⁹⁷ Mark 1:14, 15.

of the psalm in Mark's resurrection account are not accidental. Jesus has just died, his burial being arranged by Joseph of Arimathea (Mark 15:43-46). Yet the young man at the tomb announces his resurrection from the grave (Mark 16:6), just as the psalm speaks of a type of resurrection of the dead. In addition, the news of Jesus' resurrection is proclaimed by the young man, who then charges the women to announce it to the disciples as well (Mark 16:7). Both texts, therefore, deal with activities of the formerly dead,⁴⁹⁸ and the proclamation of the acts of God in rescuing his Righteous Sufferer, a proclamation that—regardless of the appearance of a lack of obedience on the part of the women (Mark 16:8)—Mark's implied readers, being Christians themselves, would know had been carried out, since they were indeed the beneficiaries of that same proclamation.⁴⁹⁹

In examining these fainter allusions to Ps 22 throughout Mark's PRN, it can be seen that his account follows the same general plot of the psalm in many ways. Many of these shared characteristics are related to Mark's presentation of Jesus as his Righteous Sufferer, who experiences the same types of persecution as the psalmist, but also receives the ultimate vindication because he experiences this persecution to the very end of his life. Marcus helpfully outlines these shared and similarly ordered themes in the following chart:

	Psalm 22	Mark
Suffering	vv. 2-22	15:20b-37
Worship of Gentiles	v. 28	15:39
Kingdom of God	v. 29	15:43
Resurrection	v. 30	16:6
Proclamation to God's people	vv. 31-32	16:7 ⁵⁰⁰

⁴⁹⁸ Matt 27:52-53 appears to pick up on this connection in an explicit manner, but more will be said about this in Chapter 9.

⁴⁹⁹ Marcus, *Way*, 182, also notes that Mark's narrative includes these similarities of resurrection and proclamation with Ps 22.

⁵⁰⁰ Marcus, *Way*, 182, although Marcus employs the versification of the English translations in his chart and throughout his chapter.

The Language of Mark 15:34

The text-critical issues concerning this saying are not terribly problematic and are relatively simple to sort out.⁵⁰¹ The first group of these includes variations on the first word of the Aramaic saying's second clause *λεμα σαβαχθανι*: (1) *λιμα σαβαχθανι*;⁵⁰² and (2) *λαμα σαβαχθανι/ζαφθανι*.⁵⁰³ The first, like the strongest option, is probably also derived from the Aramaic ܠܡܐ (‘‘why?’’), and can be explained by the auditory similarity of the two vowels. The second most likely represents the Hebrew לָמָּה (‘‘why?’’).⁵⁰⁴ There is also a variant found in codex Bezae (D) which contains ζαφθανι, a form of the Hebrew עָזַבְתָּנִי (‘‘you have abandoned me’’) from Ps

⁵⁰⁴ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 100.

22:2, rather than a form of the Aramaic שְׁכַחְתָּנִי (“you have abandoned me”) which is found in the other manuscripts.⁵⁰⁵ Neither group of variants alters the meaning of the phrase, their presence best attributed to their *Vorlage*.⁵⁰⁶

There is only one textual variant that could alter the significance and meaning of the passage. It is the substitution of the verb ὠνείδισας (ὀνειδίζω) for ἐγκατέλιπες (ἐγκαταλείπω). This changes Jesus’ question on the cross from “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” to “My God, my God, why have you reproached me?” This variant reading has very little support, however.⁵⁰⁷ It is most likely a scribal attempt to soften this shocking statement that God has abandoned Jesus into a less theologically threatening idea of reproach.⁵⁰⁸ Perhaps another explanation for the occurrence of this variant is the presence of a noun with the same root (ὀνειδος) in LXX Ps 21:7.⁵⁰⁹

The presence of Jesus’ cry from the cross, first in Aramaic and then translated into Greek, has generated a variety of questions concerning the reason(s) why Mark included the Aramaic, why he then translated it into Greek, and how it fits in with and illumines the meaning and function of the phrase in the Markan PRN.

The labeling of the Markan Jesus’ citation of Ps 22:2 as Aramaic is not often disputed. Although many see the Matthean citation as a mixture of Aramaic and Hebrew, scholars do not propose that such a mixture can be detected in Mark 15:34.⁵¹⁰ The citation in Mark 15:34 constitutes the only scriptural citation in Mark

⁵⁰⁵ The other manuscripts contain σαβαχθανι, σιβακθανει, ζαβαφθανει, or σαβαχθανει.

⁵⁰⁶ See P. J. Williams, “The Linguistic Background to Jesus’ Dereliction Cry (Matthew 27:46; Mark 15:34)” in *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background in Honour of B. W. Winter on His 65th Birthday* (eds. P. J. Williams, A. Clarke, P. Head, and D. Instone-Brewer; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 4-5, for a helpful chart of the witnesses and their variants.

⁵⁰⁷ This reading is found only in versions of the Western Codex D of the fifth century C.E.

⁵⁰⁸ So also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 100. *Contra* William J. Kenneally, “Eli, Eli, Lema Sabactani’ (Mt 27:46),” *CBQ* 8 (1946): 126, who argues that the variant ὠνείδισας actually strengthens ἐγκατέλιπες rather than softening it. Given the context of the psalm, however, it is hard to imagine that a reproach from God would be considered by anyone a harsher sentence than being abandoned by him altogether!

⁵⁰⁹ Although there is considerable difference in the subjects of reproach, where in the LXX psalm the ones who reproach the speaker are his enemies.

⁵¹⁰ See Williams, “Linguistic Background,” 1-12, for a detailed explanation of the forming of the transliteration of the Aramaic into Greek in Mark 15:34. For a more condensed explanation, see Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 99-100.

that is recorded in Aramaic. This, then, leads to a question crucial for the interpretation of the passage: Why did Mark record this cry from the cross in Aramaic? This is closely related to another important question: Why did he then include his own Greek translation of the Aramaic citation immediately following? And why, then, include the Aramaic in the first place, if only to immediately translate it into the language of the rest of the gospel?

There are several important issues involved here. First is an understanding of the meaning of the presence of the Aramaic phrase by its relation to the three other instances of Aramaic sayings from Jesus in the narrative. Given the repeated emphasis of this study on the importance of interpreting Markan passages in light of the entire narrative, a consideration of the other passages in Mark which include Aramaic words or phrases may shed light on its presence in Mark 15:34. At the very least it will highlight the similarities and differences between the narrative circumstances within which the phrases are used. The second, and related, issue concerns the function of the presence of the Aramaic phrase in Mark 15:34 in providing information about Mark's implied reader/audience. Third is the issue of the influence of the phrase in Mark's overall portrayal of Jesus as his Righteous Sufferer.

Mark includes Aramaic utterances in only three other places in his gospel narrative.⁵¹¹ The first, in Mark 5:41, comes in the context of Jesus' raising of Jairus' daughter. Here, in the midst of his performing the quite miraculous feat of raising the girl from apparent death, Jesus speaks to her in Aramaic, which is recorded by Mark: *ταλιθα κουμ*, and then translated: *τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε* ("I say to you, girl, rise up!"). Similarly, in Mark 7:34, Jesus utters the Aramaic *εφθαθα*, which Mark translates as "Be opened" (*διανοίχθητι*), which results in the opening of the ears and the tongue of a man formerly deaf and mute (7:31-37). Both of these utterances are

⁵¹¹ Excluding the word *κορβάν* in 7:11, which appears to function as a technical term in the narrative, rather than as a word of power or great significance (like those in 5:41 and 7:34); *Contra* Christoph Burchard "Markus 15:34," *ZNW* 74 (1983): 8-9. Note that *ὡσαννά* (11:9, 10) is also Aramaic, but is a loanword by the time of Mark's gospel. Also excluded are Aramaic names within the gospel.

given in order to grant physical healing. In addition, both result in provoking awe from those around him (Mark 5:42; 7:37).⁵¹²

The final instance of Aramaic in Mark's narrative is located in Jesus' prayer to God in the garden of Gethsemane (Mark 14:36). Here Jesus addresses God as $\alpha\beta\beta\alpha$. Unlike the other instances of Aramaic, Mark does not offer a formal translation of the phrase, although perhaps his inclusion of $\delta\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ immediately following the word is meant to be regarded as such, rather than standing in parallel to the preceding Aramaic title. It is also possible that the entire phrase $\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\ \delta\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ had become a catchphrase by the time of Mark's gospel (note that the phrase appears twice in Paul's letters [Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6]). All three instances of this phrase (including Mark) are present in the context of the speaker crying out to God, which indicates that $\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\ \delta\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ was likely part of the early Christian vocabulary of direct address to God in prayer.

It is difficult to determine what impact this Aramaic word $\alpha\beta\beta\alpha$ might have had on Mark's implied readers, since it is possible that it had already been adopted into the common vocabulary of Greek-speaking Jews to the extent that its Aramaic origins may have been lost on the readers.⁵¹³ Underscoring this instance of Aramaic, then, might give too much attention to a word that may have had little impact on Mark's implied readers.

What do these other instances tell us about Mark's inclusion of Aramaic in Mark 15:34? Unfortunately, they do not tell us much. It is the differences between these instances and the one in Mark 15:34 that are highlighted by comparison. For instance, unlike in Mark 5:41 and 7:34, Jesus does not use Aramaic to call down power from God on behalf of others. In addition, as noted earlier, the Aramaic phrase in Mark 15:34 is a citation from scripture, unlike the other instances of the language. What is clear from our examination of Mark's narrative at this point is that Mark rarely includes Aramaic, and when he does, he most often provides his own translation as a narrative aside.

⁵¹² Although the awe of those who witness these healings probably should not be understood as being evoked by the Markan Jesus' use of these Aramaic words, but by the *actions* that go with them that result in the healings themselves (5:42; 7:37b).

⁵¹³ For a fruitful discussion of the Gethsemane account in Mark's gospel, see Feldmeier, *Die Krisis des Gottessohnes*.

Why include the Aramaic if only immediately to provide the translation into Greek? It is possible that Mark's inclusion of the Aramaic was meant to serve as an authentication of Jesus' sayings as they are presented in his gospel. This strategy would serve to show historical particularity, i.e., to emphasize the historical rootedness of the events as Mark has narrated them.⁵¹⁴

Others have suggested that the interplay between the presence of Aramaic phrases and their subsequent interpretations in Mark's gospel is designed to indicate to his implied readers a subversion of the "*Nomena Barbera*," foreign exotic expressions uttered by magicians in order to wield supernatural powers. Thus, although it may briefly appear that Jesus is uttering magical incantations and is therefore presented as a magician, the immediate presence of Mark's own translation of these words deprives it of its magical value.⁵¹⁵ Therefore, Mark indicates to his readers that the words themselves have no power, but rather that it is the person of Jesus who possesses this power from God, and he therefore does not need to attempt a manipulation of him through (futile) magical incantations in order to accomplish mighty deeds.

How does this interpretation relate to Jesus' speaking of Aramaic in Mark's crucifixion scene? Those who argue for this view see Mark's presentation of the crucifixion as a numinous event which is not a result of Jesus' skills of manipulation as a magician, but rather as a moment of divine revelation. This is reminiscent of Moses' stand-off with Pharaoh's priests of Exod 7:8-13, where divine power is proven superior to that of magicians' tricks. Given Mark's socio-cultural context, this is entirely plausible, although there are not any clear indications that this is the point of Mark 15:34.

Another possible (and not mutually exclusive) interpretation of the purpose of the Aramaic citation in Mark 15:34 is to simply show that Jesus is a pious Jew who dies with the words of the scriptures on his lips in his native tongue, rather than in a tongue of the Gentiles, just as he addressed God in the garden on the night of his arrest (14:36). According to Brown,

⁵¹⁴ There may also be an element of showing off here, if Mark's inclusion of Aramaic phrases is meant to demonstrate to his readers his intricate knowledge of the events in Jesus' life.

⁵¹⁵ See, for example, Hurtado, *Mark*, 87, 119-120; Juel, *Exegesis*, 115.

Mark calls our attention to this contrast between the two prayers and makes it more poignant by reporting the address in each prayer in Jesus' own tongue: 'Abba' and 'Eloi,' thus giving the impression of words coming genuinely from Jesus' heart, as distinct from the rest of his words that have been preserved in a foreign language (Greek). As he faces the agony of death, the Marcan Jesus is portrayed as resorting to his mother tongue.⁵¹⁶

As has been demonstrated in the previous chapter of this study, that a Jew would cite a psalm at the moment of crisis and that it should be Ps 22 should not be surprising given its circulation and use in prayer during the first century C.E.⁵¹⁷

What might Mark's inclusion of the Aramaic citation of Ps 22:2 indicate about his implied audience? What cannot be *assumed* is that Mark's implied readers would have had no Aramaic background and would thus have *needed* a translation in Greek in order to understand the passage. As we have seen above, it is highly possible that Mark included his translations for theological and christological reasons that would have been recognized and appreciated by his audience. We will likely never have the definitive answer concerning the motivation behind Mark's inclusion of Aramaic in these passages, and more important for our purposes, in his citation of Ps 22:2, or its impact on Mark's original readers. With reference to Mark's narrative, however, we can underscore the importance of the phrase in Mark 15:34b in its existence as the singular citation of the scriptures in Aramaic, as well as its function to slow down the narrative tempo even further by way of its companion translation in Greek in 15:34c.⁵¹⁸

Something must also be said concerning the provenance of the Greek translation of Jesus' cry at the end of the verse. Was Mark using another intertext for this translation (e. g., OG, another Greek translation, or a proto-Masoretic text), or is this translation his own derived from the Aramaic citation that precedes it? As I have argued in Chapter 6, the relatively close adherence of the translation to the LXX that we now have does not necessarily suggest that Mark was using this as his intertext,

⁵¹⁶ Brown, *Death*, 2:1046-47.

⁵¹⁷ Reumann, "Psalm 22," 48, suggests that this might even have evolved into a proverbial saying during the first century C.E.

⁵¹⁸ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 89, suggests that Mark's concern for accuracy (in including the Aramaic and a Greek translation) may be explained by its use in liturgy at the time.

as some have assumed.⁵¹⁹ Although it is not clear exactly what source, if any, Mark is using here, it does appear to be an accurate translation of the Aramaic that precedes it.⁵²⁰

Only Ps 22:2?

Is Jesus' citation of Ps 22:2 from the cross an atomistic citation, or is the larger psalmic context meant to be invoked and to interpret its new context of the Markan Jesus' crucifixion? As I have already underscored at the beginning of this study, this issue is one of great importance for interpreting the Markan PRN, and is also a matter of debate among Markan scholars. The ramifications of interpreting the verse from either direction are glaring in their contrast: Either the Markan Jesus is to be seen as a man despairing of his circumstances with no hope in sight of an answer from God, or he is pictured as one who, although experiencing great suffering, also expresses the hope that God will vindicate him for all the world to see, just as God vindicated the Righteous Sufferer of the psalm (Ps 22:22b-32).

As we have seen from the introduction and the survey of literature in Chapter 1 of this study, much of what has been written on this subject has fallen into a different kind of either/or trap than the one posed above. Each group stands at the opposite ends of the spectrum (from the utter rejection of the relevance of the psalm to the assumption without evidence that the whole is in view) and their reactions are as extreme as the positions they hold. One typical reaction is to attempt to enlighten those who stand on the other side. The other is merely to dismiss with disdain the others' perceived naïveté or rampant suspicion, and question the motivation behind their interpretation. Among those who argue that Mark 15:34 should be regarded as an atomistic citation of Ps 22:2, some appeal to the "standard" Jewish practice of extracting a scripture from its original context,⁵²¹ and the lack of obvious indications in Mark's narrative that the thanksgiving portion of the psalm is in view,⁵²²

⁵¹⁹ E. g., Hoffman, "Psalm 22 (LXX 21)," whose argument is based on the assumption that Mark's citation comes from LXX Ps 21.

⁵²⁰ See Schwemer, "Jesu letzte Worte," 12-15, who argues that Mark's Greek translation is derived from the Aramaic.

⁵²¹ Juel, *Exegesis*, 114-16. Cf. also his general discussion concerning Jewish methods of atomistic exegesis (in response to Dodd, *According*): *Exegesis*, 21.

⁵²² Hooker, *Mark*, 376; Brown, *Death*, 2:1045-47; Schwemer, "Jesu letzte Worte," 14.

wondering aloud at the efficacy of citing this particular portion of the psalm if Jesus' cry is meant to be portrayed as a cry of victory or hope in the face of despair.⁵²³

In Chapter 5 of this study I examined the evidence of the presence of incipits in the scriptures, at Qumran, and in rabbinic literature, and addressed the question of whether there is sufficient plausibility from this evidence that Mark used Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 in this manner and that his implied readers would have been expected to recognize its presence in his account of Jesus' crucifixion. I have argued that there is indeed enough evidence to suggest that this is plausible in light of the socio-cultural context in which Mark's gospel was written. The fact that the tangible evidence for incipits in Jewish literature chronologically brackets and overlaps with the era in which Mark's gospel was written increases this plausibility. This, combined with the observations of Chapter 4 of this study—that Mark often does not use citations and allusions to the scriptures atomistically, but provides hints that the larger context of the passage is relevant for interpreting his own narrative—give even greater weight to the argument that Mark is drawing on this literary/liturgical strategy in Jesus' citation of Ps 22:2 from the cross. Furthermore, the invocation of the remainder of Ps 22 when interpreting the Markan Jesus' crucifixion is consistent with Mark's other interests in his overall narrative—interests which have been discussed extensively in Chapters 3 and 6 as well as the present one. These include, (a) the presentation of Jesus as his Righteous Sufferer, who is in line with the previous Righteous Sufferers of Jewish history and the more contemporary Qumran community but supersedes them with respect to both the extent of his righteousness and the form and extent of his vindication; (b) Mark's concern to prepare his implied readers to anticipate the vindication via resurrection of Jesus after his suffering and death; and (c) his inclusion of other allusions to Ps 22 in the immediate context of Mark 15:34 as well as throughout the PRN and in other portions of the gospel. The combined force of these distinct lines of evidence supports the argument that has been put forward in this study since the opening chapter: The Markan Jesus' citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 would have indicated to his implied readers that the whole psalm has interpretive merit for understanding the meaning of Mark's overall presentation of Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection.

⁵²³ Gundry, *Apology*, 966; Brown, *Death*, 2:1050-51; Hunter, *Gospel*, 144; Vincent Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice: A Study of the Passion-Sayings in the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1937), 161.

Interpreting Mark 15:34 in Light of Ps 22: Some Other Approaches

Two other strategies of interpretation employed by scholars concerning Mark 15:34 will be discussed before examining the effects of this psalm in understanding Mark's presentation of Jesus as his Righteous Sufferer throughout the gospel and especially in Jesus' cry from the cross in his PRN. Both approaches are thematic in nature. One strategy locates a particular theme within the actual citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 and then discusses other passages in Mark's gospel which deal with this same theme.⁵²⁴ The other approach links a theme found in Ps 22 itself with that same theme in Mark's own narrative. Both are inadequate in that they fail to interpret Jesus' cry from the cross with a measure of sensitivity to Mark's narrative as a whole. This is not to mean that all of these ignore the narrative and interpret Mark 15:34 in a vacuum. Rather, the accusation that they lack *sensitivity* to the narrative stems from their general methodological approach that tends to pick through the narrative in the search for passages that support the theme that they deem the most significant for interpreting Mark 15:34. It is not that the search for an overall theme is a faulty methodology in and of itself, but the practice of these scholars with which I take issue is that they take this "overarching" theme in hand and superimpose it back onto Mark 15:34 without regard for the overall Markan portrait of Jesus, the different nuances of the theme in the narrative itself, or the surrounding context of Mark 15. In addition, it must be observed that the practice of noting a pervasive theme in a narrative does not *automatically* constitute a *narrative reading*, because this practice can lead to an ignoring of other relevant information in the narrative which does not conveniently fit into an overarching schema.

An example of the first strategy of interpretation—where Mark 15:34 is interpreted by a thematic link within the explicit citation of Ps 22:2—can be found in William S. Campbell's 2004 SBL paper, "Why Did You Abandon Me?" Abandonment Christology in Mark's Gospel."⁵²⁵ Campbell argues that Mark 15:34 should be read at "face value" as strictly a cry of abandonment on the basis of a theme of isolation and abandonment throughout the gospel. He sees this theme of

⁵²⁴ Cf. the survey of interpretation in Chapter 1 of this study, where I interact with Danker, "Demonic Secret," 48-69, who virtually ignores the influence of the psalmic citation in Mark 15:34 in favor of an interpretation of this verse which involves the theme of demonic possession in Mark.

⁵²⁵ William S. Campbell, "Why Did You Abandon Me?" Abandonment Christology in Mark's Gospel" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, San Antonio, TX, November 22, 2004), 1-15.

abandonment culminating in Jesus' climactic claim of abandonment by God on the cross. He argues that Mark's reader has been prepared to expect this abandonment by God because the gospel recounts Jesus' abandonment by various groups of people in the course of the narrative. Campbell's paper is a step-by-step examination of the portions of the narrative that present Jesus' one time supporters rejecting and abandoning Jesus and his mission. Campbell examines how Jesus' neighbors, family, disciples (especially Peter), the crowd, and the bandits that are crucified with him abandon Jesus as the narrative progresses. This leads him to read Mark 15:34 strictly as an indication that God, like the others, has abandoned Jesus in his moment of need.

Although it is clear that those around Jesus reject and abandon him in his journey toward the cross during the course of Mark's narrative, there is no indication that God does or will do so. It is one thing for sinful and shortsighted humans to fail to fully grasp Jesus' purpose (for this is clearly the reason that Mark himself gives for the people's rejection and abandonment of Jesus: cf. Mark 6:1-6), but it is quite another thing to claim that God does this. Although the reader may be prepared to expect repeated abandonment by humans in the narrative, there is no indication until Mark 15:34 that God will abandon Jesus! In fact, in Mark's narrative, those who abandon Jesus are precisely those who "don't get it right" concerning Jesus' mission. If we include God in this group of people, does this imply that he doesn't "get it" either? Or are these people validated in their decision to reject and abandon Jesus? These are the types of severe problems that arise when one follows Campbell's methodology to the end.⁵²⁶

Examples abound of the second strategy of interpretation, which links themes found in other portions of the psalm with the citation of Mark 15:34 as a way of interpreting the Markan passage. Suggested themes include, (a) opposition; (b) judgment; and (c) the kingdom of God celebrated in the Eucharist.

In her expansive monograph on Jesus' cry from the cross, Caza argues that, since there is a lack of sufficient evidence for the usage of incipits during the first

⁵²⁶ See Burchard, "Markus 15:34," 1-11, who also argues that Mark's narrative *does not* prepare the reader to expect Jesus' abandonment by God (although I disagree with his other conclusions – that Jesus' cry is meant to be interpreted as a sign of his power; see my comments on this type of interpretation below). Cf. also Walter Hasenzahl, *Die Gottverlassenheit des Christus nach dem Kreuzeswort bei Matthäus und Markus und das christologische Verständnis des griechischen Psalters* (BFCT 39; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1937), for a discussion of this psalm and the themes of abandonment and Christology in the LXX, NT, Gos. Pet., and the works of Athanasius and Luther.

century C.E., the primary indicator that more of the psalm is in view in Mark's gospel than the first verse is the presence of the theme of the speaker's persecution by his enemies.⁵²⁷ She particularly focuses on the surrounding account of the crucifixion, underscoring the important role that the persecutors play in moving the narrative toward Jesus' death in Mark 15:29-32, and 36.⁵²⁸ This linking theme then allows her to bring in other aspects of the psalm which help to interpret the surrounding account of the Markan Jesus' crucifixion.

Similarly, Schmidt sees in Ps 22 and Mark 15 the theme of judgment, i.e., the judgment of the Jews (in Mark 15, those who initiate Jesus' suffering and death and then mock him during his crucifixion) which results in the acceptance of the Gentiles into God's salvation plan.⁵²⁹ In fact, he sees judgment as the theme which unifies the whole of Mark 15:33-39, most clearly indicated in the presence of darkness and the tearing of the temple veil.⁵³⁰ According to Schmidt, Jesus' citation from the cross in Mark 15:34 is not spoken from his own perspective, but rather is meant to be understood as words spoken on behalf of the Jewish people. Thus, it is *the Jews* who are being abandoned by God as judgment for their rejection of Jesus, rather than Jesus himself being abandoned by God.⁵³¹ This focus on judgment which results in the worship of the Gentiles stems from his location of the same theme in the thanksgiving portion of Ps 22:22b-32.⁵³²

In the survey of interpretation in Chapter 1, I noted that Gese has argued that the eschatological theme of Ps 22:22b-32 provides the interpretive key for understanding the Markan Jesus' citation of Ps 22:2. More specifically, he sees the original liturgical context of the *tôdā* meal as the background of the psalm which is then

⁵²⁷ Caza, *Mon Dieu*.

⁵²⁸ Caza, *Mon Dieu*, 419.

⁵²⁹ Thomas E. Schmidt, "Cry of Dereliction or Cry of Judgment? Mark 15:34 in Context," *BBR* 4 (1994): 145-53.

⁵³⁰ Schmidt, "Cry," 145.

⁵³¹ Schmidt, "Cry," 146, 151-52. He argues that the darkness of Mark 15:33 is not merely a description of the setting of the crucifixion, but functions in conjunction with Jesus' cry as a pronouncement of judgment, 147.

⁵³² But *contra* Schmidt, it is difficult to see where judgment *per se* fits in to this portion of the psalm, unless one takes it as an implicit verdict on the speaker's persecutors (Ps 22: 7-9, 13-14, 17-19) that the Gentiles will soon worship God. This, however, assumes that the psalmist's enemies are Jewish, which is not apparent from the psalm. At any rate, it is not clear to me that judgment is a dominant theme of the latter half of Ps 22. Schmidt would have done well to prove this rather than assume it.

linked to the Eucharist, a reconstruction of the death and resurrection of Jesus. The fulfillment of Ps 22 is carried out in the event of Jesus' death and resurrection, and the Eucharist is a confession of this event, just as the *tôdā* was the confession of the individual's rescue by God.⁵³³

Although these thematic approaches to the interpretation of Mark 15:34 do contribute to our understanding of the passage and to the discussion in general, they fall short of a robust reading of the narrative. This is due to the inherent nature of this type of thematic approach to narrative (and to intertextuality), which automatically excludes elements of relevance which do not fit in the schema from which the observations begin. As will be argued more extensively in the concluding section of this chapter (when we have all of our evidence laid out before us), the interpretive import of Mark's citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34, and by extension the rest of the psalm, is not bound to merely one linking theme between the intertexts. Instead the link is present by way of the presentation of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer like that of the psalm. Thus, the connection between the texts is one of *identity*, rather than theme. This approach can encompass all the individual themes which are shared between Ps 22 and Mark's narrative without excluding any relevant ones or elevating any one to an artificial status of importance.

Mark 15:34 in Its Narrative Context

Let us now examine the meaning and function of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 in light of Mark's narrative, with particular attention to the surrounding context of Jesus' cry from the cross, and with an aim to interpret this passage in light of Mark's overall portrayal of the person of Jesus in the whole gospel. This method is distinguished from the ones critiqued above in, (a) its sensitivity to the intricate layers of the narrative, a narrative which includes many different themes rather than a singular theme; and (b) its resistance to the extraction of the text from its surrounding context and its interpretation in isolation. Thus, for instance, passages that deal with the theme of abandonment interwoven throughout Mark's narrative may inform our understanding of Mark 15:34, but are in no way given priority over the apparent use of the word in the present context (i.e., they are not superimposed onto the passage at hand lest they silence its own voice and impact in the narrative). In fact, the issue of

⁵³³ Gese, "Psalm 22," 198-200. Yet one might wonder where there are any indications in Mark's account of the crucifixion that the Eucharist is in view, as this does not appear to be the concern of Mark at this point.

abandonment in Mark 15:34—the portion of Jesus’ words which serves as the most problematic for interpreters, and yet is the most dynamic—will prove a prime subject with which to demonstrate the type of narrative reading for which I am calling. The following exercise, then, will focus on several questions which are brought to the fore when we embark on a close reading of the Markan Jesus’ crucifixion in light of his words from the cross:

- 1) Does Mark 15:34 really imply abandonment by God in the sense of the removal of his presence? What does “abandonment” (ἐγκαταλείπω) mean here and elsewhere?
- 2) How does the fact that the speaker of Ps 22 turns out *not* to be abandoned by God affect the interpretation of the Markan Jesus’ cry from the cross (if it does at all)? Is there any indication in Mark 15 that God heard Jesus’ cry just as he did the psalmist’s?
- 3) Can a supposed abandonment of Jesus by God in Mark 15 be reconciled with the other passages in Mark’s narrative which portray the relationship between Father and Son?
- 4) If the Markan Jesus is found not to be abandoned by God in the narrative, how is this reconciled with Jesus’ apparent suffering and death?

Fundamental to an understanding of the Markan Jesus’ citation of Ps 22:2 is the meaning of the phrase εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;. More specifically, what does the Aramaic word ܩܬܝܬܝܢ, ⁵³⁴ from which σαβαχθανι is transliterated, and its translation ἐγκατέλιπές με mean? Both ܩܬܝܬܝܢ and the Hebrew עזב (MT) have the sense of “leaving.”⁵³⁵ What does this “leaving” entail? Is it a complete abandonment, i.e., leaving alone (in this case, God removing his presence from the speaker), or could it have the sense of leaving helpless? Gould argues that in Ps 22 the meaning is the latter, i.e., that God has not withdrawn his presence but his help, which results in the

⁵³⁴ Williams, “Linguistic Background,” 4.

⁵³⁵ The suggestion of Dan Cohn-Sherbok, “Jesus’ Cry on the Cross: An Alternative View,” *ExpTim* 93 (1982): 215-17, that the Aramaic behind the citation here is not from Ps 22:2 but is the rhetorical question “My God, My God why have you praised me?,” derived from the word ܫܒܚܬܝܢܝ which he argues is transliterated in Greek in exactly the same way as Ps 22:2, should be dismissed, since he offers no evidence upon which to base his suggestion.

psalmist being delivered over to his persecutors.⁵³⁶ In addition, as has been previously noted, only one other time outside of Ps 22 is God said to have actually abandoned an individual.⁵³⁷ Despite these observations, however, it is not possible to determine which meaning applies to the Markan Jesus from the meaning of the word alone. The narrative context of the citation from the cross must be used as an interpretive tool in uncovering the meaning of the phrase as it is used in its Markan context. What is helpful from this general discussion of the meaning of σαβαθάνει is that it highlights the existence of possible nuances of the term—the meaning of “abandon” in Mark 15:34 may not be as obvious as is often assumed.

The speaker in Ps 22 begins his psalm by lamenting the apparent silence from and/or absence of God in helping him in his hour of need. However, later in the psalm the speaker praises God for saving him from his enemies (22:22b), and even states that God did not hide his face (in the sense of presence in the LXX: τὸ πρόσωπον) from him, and heard his cry (22:25b). Although the psalmist indeed temporarily felt that God had left him at the mercy of his enemies, it turns out that God listened to his cry and acted on his behalf to rescue him. Are there any indications in the immediate context of Mark 15:34 that suggest that the same fate awaits Jesus, or at least that God will listen, or is listening, to his cry? In Chapter 3 of this study several events surrounding the crucifixion of Jesus were examined as indications that God would vindicate his Righteous Sufferer, Jesus, after his death. I have argued that the tearing of the temple veil in Mark 15:38, by its very nature a supernatural event, suggests that it is God’s immediate response to Jesus’ death (15:37). Like a similar tearing (σχίζω) of the heavens at his baptism (Mark 1:9-11), it functions in several ways. First, it indicates that God condones Jesus’ actions. Second, it underscores his continued relationship with his son. Third, it anticipates the future vindication that will take place in the form of his resurrection from the dead.

Similarly, the centurion’s confession signals within the narrative the recognition by at least one witness that Jesus’ relationship with God does not cease upon his crucifixion. This is indicated by Mark’s narrative placement of the

⁵³⁶ Ezra P. Gould, *The Gospel According to Mark* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1896), 294. So also Kenneally, “Eli,” 129, (appealing to Gesenius), who states that this meaning is indicated by the combination of the verb with the accusative of the person.

⁵³⁷ 2 Chr 32:31.

confession (following the tearing of the temple veil), and by the physical position of the centurion in facing the cross while uttering his exclamation of Jesus' identity (it is the manner in which Jesus' dies which inspires the confession).

Finally, the ultimate indication of God's presence with Jesus is found in the last scene of the gospel, where Jesus' resurrection from the dead is announced to the women at the tomb in Mark 16:6. Thus, in an even more spectacular display of deliverance than that of the psalmist's experience, Jesus is rescued by God from the grave itself.

All of these events in the immediate context of Jesus' crucifixion serve in one respect as narrative indicators that, like the psalmist, the Markan Jesus has not been abandoned by God in the sense that the presence of God has left him altogether. Instead these phenomena suggest that the "abandonment" of Jesus refers to his helpless situation at the hands of his enemies.⁵³⁸ Knowing the outcome of the psalm which Jesus begins to cite, however, Mark's implied readers would also have been aware that the psalmist did indeed experience vindication by God from his enemies; that God did not leave him to despair but heard his cry and answered it. This would likely have had a profound impact on their own understanding of Jesus' passion and resurrection in general, and his cry from the cross in particular.

One of the most important indications that God did not "abandon" Jesus (in the sense of a withdrawal of his presence) is in the way God interacts with Jesus at other points in the Markan narrative. How has Mark presented the relationship between Jesus and God? In both instances where God speaks in the Markan narrative, he affirms Jesus' ministry and makes clear that his relationship with his son is one of love (Mark 1:11; 9:7). Additionally, in 14:36, Mark again highlights this close relationship by narrating how Jesus goes to God in his hour of need and addresses him as $\alpha\beta\beta\alpha$. Given this portrayal of closeness between Father and son, it would then seem counterproductive and counterintuitive for Mark to undermine this relationship by asserting that God has left his son at his darkest hour. Once again, the centurion's comment in Mark 15:39 may function as an implicit reaffirmation of the relationship between God and Jesus. Despite death and apparent defeat (and precisely in this event), the two are "in this together."

⁵³⁸ Burchard, "Markus 15:34," 6-7, believes that the darkness in Mark 15:33 may also be an indication that God is with him and has not abandoned him (by its essence as a supernatural display of power).

Although it is difficult to understand exactly what is entailed in the “abandonment” of Mark 15:34 when one examines it as part of the citation alone, other events in the Markan narrative can shed light on how his implied readers up to this point would have understood the relationship between God and Jesus, and thus would have understood this citation from the cross. The events of Jesus’ baptism and transfiguration, his prayer in the garden, the tearing of the veil, the confession of the centurion, and, most importantly, his resurrection from the dead, all serve to indicate that God’s presence was not removed in Jesus’ ordeal at the hands of his persecutors. Nevertheless, this is not to mitigate the extent to which Jesus is presented as suffering before and on the cross. To say that he was not abandoned, or that the whole of Ps 22 is in view in Mark 15:34, is not necessarily a refusal to recognize Mark’s depiction of his suffering. The psalmist clearly suffered at the hands of his enemies (Ps 22:2, 7-9, 13-19). So also, in Mark, Jesus’ experience on the cross involved suffering and death, a fact which cannot and should not be ignored. Jesus’ suffering is clearly an important emphasis in Mark’s gospel as a whole, as evidenced, for instance, by his repeated passion-resurrection predictions dispersed throughout the gospel (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34).

Mark 15:34 and Psalm 22

In Chapter 1 of this study I briefly surveyed Vernon Robbins’ work on the function of Ps 22 in Mark’s PRN.⁵³⁹ Although a significant portion of his essay is devoted to the argument that there is an intertextual relationship between Mark’s crucifixion account and the accounts of the Sacian feast of Dio Chrysostom’s *Oration 4*, it is his work on the rhetorical effect of the allusions and citation of Ps 22 which is of interest here.⁵⁴⁰

In the process of examining how Mark includes language from Ps 22, Robbins comes to the conclusion that the presence in the narrative of the allusions and citation of the psalm in reverse order from the psalm suggests that Mark’s account is meant to be read as a subversion of the rhetoric of the psalm. He accuses those who read Mark 15:34 as a cry that carries with it a positive meaning of imposing the rhetoric of Ps 22 upon the rhetoric of Mark’s passion narrative. The

⁵³⁹ Robbins, “Reversed Contextualization,” 1161-1183.

⁵⁴⁰ Robbins, “Reversed Contextualization,” 1175-81.

psalmist expresses hope to the end, whereas Jesus' last words are an expression of abandonment. He reads Jesus' expression as a question that is void of any hope for rescue, as it is the final "word" from Ps 22 in the Markan narrative.⁵⁴¹

Robbin's approach and conclusion raise fundamental questions concerning the nature of the relationship between Ps 22 and Mark's appropriation of it in his narrative of Jesus' death and resurrection. These are questions that we have highlighted previously, but they bear repeating again: What is the relationship between the events in the story of Jesus' crucifixion as narrated in Mark and the events that take place in the account of the persecution of the psalmist in Ps 22? Do the events of the narrative of Jesus' crucifixion lead the writer to see affinities between the Jesus story and Ps 22? Or does Mark's alleged "reverse" use of Ps 22 become primary, thus driving the narrative of the passion? If the latter, then how do we regard the surrounding events in Mark's narrative which do not fit into the scheme of Ps 22 (e.g. the offering of ὄζος in Mark 15:36)? Which text, then, should receive priority to influence interpretation: Mark's narrative or Ps 22?

Throughout this study I have called for an interpretation of Mark's use of Ps 22 in his PRN that gives priority of place to his own narrative. To take the Markan narrative as the driving force and determining factor of interpretation is to guard against reading into Jesus' cry from the cross the constraints of the psalm. This does not mean to say that Mark ignores the plot of the psalm and the plight of the Righteous Sufferer in it and fails to use it to illumine his own presentation of Jesus. In fact, from the beginning of this study it has been my aim to show that Mark indeed does intend Ps 22 to inform his narrative.

Furthermore, Mark's appropriation of the psalm fits well into an account of the sufferings of a man being crucified. Thus, in one sense it is a matter of practicality. The order of the Ps 22 allusions and citations may be best accounted for by their fit into the larger plot of the events of Jesus' trial and crucifixion, and not by some imposed rhetorical structure around which the story of Jesus' crucifixion is built. For example, would it have made sense for Mark to present the climactic cry of abandonment before the climax of the crucifixion? Given the plot of the passion story (trial → abuse → crucifixion), the respective allusions to Ps 22 "make sense" in the places in which we find them. Would they have made sense in a different place? If not, can we with any confidence attribute a rhetorical motivation for the inclusion

⁵⁴¹ Robbins, "Reversed Contextualization," 1179.

and order of these allusions? Although this type of argument may sound similar to the “chicken and the egg” conundrum (which came first, the narrative events, or the rhetorical ordering of Ps 22 allusions?), it touches upon the deeper issue of the priority of the author to adopt or adapt (or, according to Robbins, subvert) the original context in order to serve his own interests. Yet, Robbins appears to ignore the function of the inclusion of elements from Ps 22 in Mark’s larger PRN, instead focusing only on the function of the allusions and citation of Ps 22 in their relation to each other (in reversed order), and contrasting this order with the psalm itself. Robbins asserts that his interpretation gives priority to Mark’s narrative; yet, in the end, Robbins’ focus is not on the Markan narrative of Jesus’ death, but on the subverted narrative of the psalmist.

Supposing that the order of the allusions and citation in the Markan narrative would have elicited the interpretation Robbins supports, this reversed order is not as neat and tidy as it appears to him. The order is interrupted when one takes the centurion’s confession of Mark 15:39 as an allusion to the worship of the nations in the thanksgiving section of the psalm, which follows the supposed last word of despair on the cross.

Most importantly, this “subversive” order is completely turned on its head with the inclusion of Mark’s resurrection account in 16:1-8! If Mark had meant to leave his implied readers with the impression that Jesus was completely and utterly abandoned by God without receiving his intervention as the psalmist had, why did he include such a triumphant ending of vindication in his narrative? It seems to me that the most effective means of achieving the type of impression Robbins’ sees in the crucifixion account would have been to leave Jesus on the cross with these damning words on his lips as he breathes his last; but Mark’s narrative does nothing of the sort! It provides implicit signs of affirmation and validation in the form of the tearing of the temple veil and the centurion’s confession, and ends with the ultimate direct instance of vindication in Jesus’ resurrection from the dead. If there is any subversion in Mark’s PRN, it is the subversion of death’s power over Jesus!

Mark 15:34 and 15:37

After his citation from Ps 22:2 (and the misunderstanding it causes in Mark 15:35-36), the Markan Jesus gives a final loud cry, φωνήν μεγάλην , and breathes his last (15:37). Is there any relationship between his last recorded words and his final

inarticulate cry? What is the significance of this verse? Some recent scholars, as well as ancient ones, have seen in the last cry of Jesus evidence of his power in giving up his life voluntarily.⁵⁴² Others see this as evidence that Jesus actually spoke the full psalm on the cross, appealing to the shared manner in which Jesus uttered both of these, i.e., in a loud voice (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, φωνῇ μεγάλῃν).⁵⁴³ Brown suggests that Jesus' final cry should be understood as one made in prayer, since "prayers made with a loud cry are relatively frequent in the biblical story."⁵⁴⁴ Supporting this is the observation that the Jewish ritual of afternoon prayers took place during the ninth hour.⁵⁴⁵

All of the above suggestions are speculative, at best. The most helpful observation concerning the relationship between Mark 15:34 and 15:37, not surprisingly, takes into account the latter's presence in the narrative sequence of the crucifixion account. Hurtado sees a link in the loud cry of Mark 15:37 with the tearing of the temple veil, which immediately follows in 15:38.⁵⁴⁶ This is supported by the presence of the conjunction καί at the beginning of Mark 15:38, which suggests a linking of the two verses. This is in contrast to the presence of the disjunctive δέ at the beginning of Mark 15:37, which indicates a subtle distancing from 15:36, and another δέ immediately following in 15:39. While the significance of these words should not be exaggerated, it does at least suggest that Mark 15:37 and 15:38 should be considered together as events in close relationship to one another.⁵⁴⁷ By understanding Jesus' loud cry of Mark 15:37 in light of the tearing of the temple

⁵⁴² Burchard, "Markus 15:34," 10; Tertullian, *Apol.*, 21.19; Origen, *Cels.*, 3.32.

⁵⁴³ Gese, "Psalm 22," 194-95; Richard J. Dillon, "The Psalms of the Suffering Just in the Accounts of Jesus' Passion," *Worship* 61 (1987): 436: "Still more significant is the evidence in Mark 15:33-39 that the full content of Ps 22, not just the opening lament, should be understood as the interpretive framework of the death-scene. For one thing, the 'loud voice' of Jesus' prayer in Mk 15:34 is also noted at v. 37, but this second cry, accompanying his death, remains wordless. Since the 'loud voice' connects the two cries, are we not to understand that the same psalm 22, the full psalm, remained on the Savior's lips to the last?"

⁵⁴⁴ Brown, *Death*, 2:1044. He lists as examples 1 Kgs 8:55; Ezek 11:13; Neh 9:4; Lk 17:15; 19:37-38.

⁵⁴⁵ Cf. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 494, although Brown, *Death*, 2:1044, is right to question whether Mark's implied readers would have been expected to recognize this connection unless it reflects some corresponding church practice of prayer to commemorate the day of Jesus' death.

⁵⁴⁶ Hurtado, *Mark*, 268.

⁵⁴⁷ The indention of Mark 15:38 in NA²⁷ is misleading at this point.

veil, Hurtado sees the cry as one of victory rather than defeat.⁵⁴⁸ This may, perhaps, be the case, but it must be nuanced. The link between the utterances of the Markan Jesus in Mark 15:34 and 15:37 by way of the shared phrase φωνήν μεγάλην brings in the additional factor of Jesus' agony on the cross, as indicated by his citation of Ps 22:2. Yet this suffering brings with it the promise of vindication (as we have seen in other elements in the Markan narrative). Thus, Jesus will indeed be victorious through his suffering and death, which brings about resurrection. Both suffering and victory, then, are far from incompatible in Mark's narrative, and may indeed be implied by the connection between Mark 15:34 and 15:37.⁵⁴⁹

Why *Ps 22*?

Important connections between Ps 22 and the Markan narrative have been highlighted throughout this chapter, with an emphasis on how Mark has appropriated the psalm to paint a portrait of Jesus' suffering, death, and vindication. What has not yet been addressed is the question: Why *this* verse from *this* psalm? The multiple connections between the circumstances of the speaker of Ps 22 and the Markan Jesus are clearly evident throughout Mark's PRN. Why, then, did he choose this verse to place on the lips of Jesus, a verse which has caused so much speculation and debate due to its surface meaning apart from the remainder of the psalm? As I have noted in the introductory chapter of this study, the suggestion that this citation from Ps 22:2 indicates simply that Jesus died in accordance with the will of God⁵⁵⁰ or as a fulfilment of scripture⁵⁵¹ fails to answer the question. There are many psalms and other passages in the scriptures which would function in this manner quite nicely, and, I might add, would result in far less controversy!⁵⁵² With regard to the presence of the opening verse of the psalm, I have presented an argument in Chapter 5 pointing to evidence that Mark's implied readers would have recognized in this

⁵⁴⁸ Hurtado, *Mark*, 268. This interpretation stands on viewing the meaning of the tearing of the temple veil as an indication that Jesus' death provides a new access to God which replaces the temple.

⁵⁴⁹ We must also acknowledge the possibility that Jesus' loud cry of Mark 15:37 may simply be Mark's way of portraying the great effort it took for Jesus to speak or communicate in any way while in the throes of his suffering on the cross.

⁵⁵⁰ Cf. Suhl, *Die Funktion*, 52; Juel, *Exegesis*, 116.

⁵⁵¹ Cf. Harvey D. Lange, "The Relationship Between Psalm 22 and the Passion Narrative," *CTM* 43 (1972): 610-21.

⁵⁵² So also Taylor, *Jesus*, 158-59.

citation an indication that the whole psalm is in view and its relevance for the interpretation of Jesus' crucifixion.

What is it about Ps 22 that suggested itself as an appropriate scriptural reference for understanding the Markan Jesus' death? What do all of these allusions and the citation to Ps 22 in Mark's PRN indicate? Arguing from the belief that in the first century C.E., many of the Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer, and especially this psalm, were regarded as having eschatological emphases, Marcus believes this to be the main purpose of its inclusion in this narrative.⁵⁵³ In a similar argument, Gese advocates an eschatological reading of the narrative, based on the vindication of the Righteous Sufferer recounted at the end of the psalm, which hints at the promise of resurrection for God's people (Ps 22:29).⁵⁵⁴ Although eschatology has an important bearing on our understanding of the passion and resurrection of Jesus, it does not appear to be the primary emphasis in Mark's narrative. Rather, I believe that the ultimate purpose of Mark's use of this psalm is to identify Jesus as the ultimate Righteous Sufferer. By putting on the lips of Jesus the first verse of Ps 22, Mark, in essence, is saying to his readers, "Look at the sufferings of Jesus and the beginning indications of God's vindication of his son. Does he not remind you of the Righteous Sufferer? That is because Jesus is the true Righteous Sufferer, and *because of this*, his actions and the subsequent actions of God have universal implications!" In other words, one can expect eschatological implications resulting from the death of Jesus *because of his identity* as the only truly Righteous Sufferer. As Mays has so aptly put it, "The experiences of the one who prays in the psalm become part of the scenario of the passion. So, the gospels draw a connection not only between the prayers of Jesus and the psalm, but as well between the *person of Jesus* and the person portrayed in the self-description of the psalm (italics mine)."⁵⁵⁵ In addition, so that the readers do not miss the connection, Mark includes various allusions throughout the narrative, some involving the suffering of the Righteous Sufferer, others alluding to the vindication that he will ultimately receive as God uses his sufferings to inaugurate his kingdom.

⁵⁵³ Marcus, *Way*, 177-79, cites 1QH XIII:31 and 4QPs^f as examples of this type of eschatological interpretation, as well as the Targum on Ps 22:31.

⁵⁵⁴ Gese, "Psalm 22," 192-96.

⁵⁵⁵ Mays, "Prayer," 322-23.

Other scholars concur with my conclusions that Ps 22 in Mark's narrative functions to identify the two Righteous Sufferers of the texts—the psalmist and Jesus. Burchard sees the allusion to Ps 22:19 in Mark 15:24 as the identification of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer like the psalmist. This is apparent in their clothing being divided up among their enemies as a signal of their impending death.⁵⁵⁶ Stolz lists several affinities between the Markan account of Jesus' crucifixion and the plight and vindication of the psalmist, which include the absence of any companions, the mixture of elements of sorrow and praise/distress and thanksgiving in each of their stories, and the presence of the apocalyptic element in both of the anticipation of the dominion of God (indicated in the Markan account by the tearing of the veil).⁵⁵⁷

Besides the connections between the figure of Ps 22 and the Markan Jesus in the shared circumstances of each—evident both explicitly and implicitly in the gospel narrative—the connection is also evident in the other independent strands of evidence we have examined and discussed throughout this study. Specifically, in Mark's other uses of the scriptures we have located a precedent for interpreting the allusion or citation in light of its original context, which stretches beyond the portion to which he has alluded or cited. In our examination of the socio-cultural milieu of Mark's gospel, we have evidence in the Qumran community that Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer in general, and Ps 22 in particular, were appropriated in such a way as to highlight the identification of the Teacher of Righteousness with the suffering psalmist. Lastly, and most importantly, we have seen in Mark's own narrative his portrayal of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer who will suffer and die and will experience vindication, just as the psalmist of Ps 22 suffers but is vindicated by God.

The advantage of describing the relationship between Ps 22 and the Markan narrative as one of identity between the two protagonists is its ability to include and incorporate all of the various shared themes found in these two narratives without excluding any or prioritizing them in a superficial manner. Thus, the themes which have served for other scholars as the primary link between the two intertexts no longer become primary, but are subsumed under the larger, and more predominant

⁵⁵⁶ Burchard, "Markus 15:34," 5.

⁵⁵⁷ Fritz Stolz, "Psalm 22: Alttestamentliches Reden vom Menschen und neutestamentliches Reden von Jesus," *ZTK* 77 (1980): 129-48.

issue of the identity of the figures. If the primary relationship between Ps 22 and Mark's account of Jesus' crucifixion, then, is one of the identity of the figures, themes such as the persecution of the speaker by his enemies, the Righteous Sufferer's helplessness ("abandonment"), and the inclusion of the Gentiles in the worship of God are incorporated and given the appropriate amount of emphasis (consistent with the emphasis given in Ps 22 and in the Markan narrative) and are understood as contributing toward this identification of Jesus as Mark's Righteous Sufferer.

Chapter 8

Conclusions (Chapters 3-7)

Throughout this study I have presented a variety of evidence which supports the argument of my thesis: Mark's implied readers would have interpreted Jesus' citation of Ps 22:2 from the cross in light of the larger context of the psalm, and this would have been essential in forming their understanding of Jesus' identity as portrayed throughout Mark's narrative, and especially in his death and imminent resurrection. At this point it might be helpful to reiterate the evidence provided, as well as highlight how each of these evidences substantiates the thesis claim.

Jesus' impending vindication via resurrection is of great importance to the Markan narrative, as emphasized by the repeated foreshadowing of this event in conjunction with predictions about his coming death [Chapter 3]. The first strand of evidence came through an examination of how Mark prepared his implied readers to anticipate Jesus' vindication through resurrection throughout his narrative. It was an attempt to provide a more balanced interpretation of his narrative, which gave due attention to the importance that the Markan Jesus' impending resurrection plays in the gospel, rather than emphasizing the theme of Jesus' suffering and death and downplaying the theme of his resurrection. This was done by considering such evidence as the passion-resurrection predictions (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33, 34). These predictions, despite their common misnomer in Markan studies as "passion predictions," consistently conclude with the prediction of Jesus' resurrection after his suffering and death. I also considered other passages in the narrative that contain foreshadowing of Jesus' vindication through resurrection, which include portions of the passion account proper. The important function of the foreshadowing of Jesus' resurrection throughout the Markan narrative in creating anticipation of his vindication after suffering and death on the part of Mark's implied readers has crucial ramifications for my thesis.

The implied readers' expectation of Jesus' vindication after suffering, fostered by the various passages which foreshadow these events in the Markan narrative, makes it likely that the same plot of Ps 22 (the suffering and vindication of the speaker) would have been recalled when Mark includes the allusions and citation

of the psalm in the context of Jesus' death. In other words, it was argued that an allusion to the whole of Ps 22 in Mark 15:34 would likely have not gone unrecognized by his implied readers because they would have been prepared previously by the narrative to anticipate and recognize the shared reference (implicit in the citation, explicit in the narrative) to his vindication contained within the plot of the psalm.

From the examination of the passages selected, it appears that, although Mark does not adhere strictly to one strategy or another, in the majority of cases he uses the scriptures contextually, i.e., the larger context of the allusion or citation (which is not present explicitly in the narrative) is intended to impact the interpretation of the Markan passage [Chapter 4]. I then set out to examine whether Mark uses his citations and allusions to the scriptures atomistically or contextually. This was done by selecting a sampling of passages in the narrative that reflect Mark's intertextual usage of scripture. The selection of these passages was meant to represent the variety that is found in Mark's gospel. Some were allusions and some were citations. They were selected from various genres in the scriptures (psalms, historical books, prophetic books). They were also taken from various passages throughout the Markan narrative, rather than reflecting a concentration on one particular section of the gospel. The purpose of this chapter was to detect a pattern, if any, in Mark's use of the scriptures. The key factor in determining how these allusions and citation function, it was argued, is their narrative context in Mark.

This has important ramifications for the interpretation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34. If, by my examination of Mark's use of the scriptures elsewhere in the gospel, it had been shown that Mark rarely or never alludes or cites scripture contextually, I would be hard-pressed to find any grounds on which to argue that Mark is reversing the trend and citing Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 contextually. The fact that Mark does indeed favor the contextual usage of the scriptures lends considerable weight to the likelihood that he is again doing so in Mark 15:34.

A variety of evidence from Mark's socio-cultural milieu, such as the presence of a cohesive tradition of the Righteous Sufferer, the liturgical use of psalms in the first century, and the textual use of Ps 22 in this period, provides support for arguing that Mark's implied readers would have interpreted Mark 15:34 in light of the larger context of Ps 22 [Chapter 5]. The information in this chapter is important for any study of this passage, as it underscores the fact that Mark did not write his gospel in a

vacuum, but was influenced by the culture that surrounded him (and the same applies to his implied readers). Two main issues were addressed. First, it was argued that there was indeed a cohesive tradition of the Righteous Sufferer in the scriptures and extra-canonical texts. Texts belonging to this tradition contained elements that would have been recognized by anyone who was familiar with this literature as belonging to this motif of the Righteous Sufferer. This issue is important for our purposes because it has been argued by Markan scholars that there was not a cohesive tradition of the Righteous Sufferer during the first century, and that Mark did not portray his Jesus as one such figure. This section of the chapter provides the grounds, located in the socio-cultural milieu of Mark's gospel, for arguing for the likelihood that Mark made use of this tradition in portraying the events of Jesus' death and resurrection. The following chapter builds on this evidence by arguing that Mark's Jesus is one such Righteous Sufferer, most clearly evidenced in his application of Ps 22 in portraying his identity as one who suffers and is vindicated by God.

Second, I explored various liturgical and textual uses of the psalms (and Ps 22 specifically) in the first century as a way of understanding how Mark might have been using Ps 22 in his gospel. This involved a variety of issues. First, it was argued that the presence of incipits in texts both before, contemporary with, and after the writing of Mark's gospel increase the likelihood that Mark also made use of this technique in 15:34, and that his implied readers would have recognized it and interpreted the passage accordingly. Second, the evidence we have of the liturgical uses of the psalms in the temple, synagogue, and at Qumran in the first century provides an important background for understanding the familiarity that Jews and Christians of that time had with the psalms. Knowledge of the psalms used in worship would have been required if one was to participate in the chanting which took place in centers of worship for both Jews and Christians. This increases the likelihood that Mark's implied readers would have had sufficient knowledge of Ps 22 to "fill in the blanks" left by the use of the incipit of the psalm in Mark 15:34. In addition, extra-canonical texts that make use of Ps 22 to portray a suffering protagonist who is (or will be) ultimately vindicated by God were discussed. The relatively contemporary use of the psalm with Mark's gospel constitutes an important background from which to understand Mark's own use of Ps 22.

Mark does indeed present his Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer figure [Chapter 6]. This is most evident in his use of Ps 22 to portray the identity of Jesus as one who

suffers, dies, but is vindicated by God via resurrection. However, I argue that this thread runs throughout Mark's gospel, once again underscoring the need to interpret Mark 15:34 in light of the entire narrative.

An exegesis of Mark 15:34 and its surrounding context provides even further evidence that Mark's citation of Ps 22:2 was contextual and would have been recognized as such by his implied readers [Chapter 7]. This included a discussion of such issues as: (a) the allusions to Ps 22 throughout Mark's narrative; (b) Mark's use of Aramaic in Mark 15:34 and other passages in the gospel; (c) the impact of the incipit in Mark 15:34; (d) the problem of "abandonment" in Mark 15:34 and the surrounding narrative; (e) the import of the order of allusions and citation to Ps 22 in Mark's PRN; and (f) the importance of interpreting Mark 15:34 in light of the entire psalm for understanding Mark's portrayal of Jesus' identity.

The aim of this study has been to provide independent strands of evidence for interpreting the citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 in light of the entire psalm. I reiterate the advantage of this two-fold strategy: Since no one argument depends upon another, (1) a foundational relationship between each argument is not necessary, i. e., one argument does not build upon another, but instead maintains its relevance individually insofar as it contributes toward the thesis above; and therefore (2) the reader can disagree with any one strand of the evidence considered and still be convinced by the overall argument. Another important contribution of this study is in its methodological aim to interpret the focal passage (Mark 15:34) in light of the entire narrative of Mark's gospel. This recognizes the importance of the narrative to shape and prepare the implied reader for what will come next in the story of the Markan Jesus. This is especially crucial when attempting to understand and interpret the difficult narrative of Jesus' crucifixion, and the even more difficult citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34.

In pursuit of the answer to my thesis, I have also touched upon several issues which have larger ramifications for understanding the narrative of Mark's gospel and his presentation of Jesus—issues of which space did not provide me the opportunity to explore further. Some of these include: (a) Mark's use of the scriptures (a comprehensive examination of how he incorporates citations and allusions in his narrative and how they inform it); (b) Mark's scriptural sources (an identification of these and their subsequent influence on interpretation); and (c) the importance of the

anticipation and event of the resurrection in Mark's gospel. Each of these, while serving the interests of a specific passage in this study (Mark 15:34), could be applied to any number of specific passages in Mark, as well as being studied in their own right, providing areas for further study.

Throughout this study I have argued that Mark's implied readers would have followed the narrative clues given throughout the gospel and would have rightly interpreted the citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 contextually. To conclude this study, it seemed appropriate to search for some indication that Mark's implied readers did indeed interpret this passage in this manner. Given that the gospels of Matthew and Luke are our earliest tangible "readers" of Mark's gospel, it seems fitting to conclude with an examination of what they understood Mark to be doing with Ps 22 in his PRN, and how they adopted and adapted his use of Ps 22 for their own portrayals of Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection. The final chapter of this study will be a "test case" of my argument thus far, using Matthew and Luke as the earliest examples of Mark's implied readers.

The decision to separate this final chapter from the body of the thesis was made for two reasons. First, it is an attempt to be consistent with the overall methodology of this study, which has intentionally focused on the *Markan* use of Ps 22 and has resisted the common tendency in synoptic scholarship to compare and contrast Mark's gospel with Matthew and Luke (often to the denigration of Mark's gospel). Thus, it was important first to consider the evidence as available in Mark's gospel, without allowing the other gospels to influence that evidence and its subsequent interpretation. This leads to the second reason for separating this following chapter from the body of the study. Since it has been the focus of this study to interpret the use of Ps 22 from the perspective of the Markan narrative, all evidence thus far has either been derived from this gospel narrative, or, in the case of extratextual evidence, has been considered specifically with an eye toward the Markan socio-cultural milieu and how these factors might have impacted both the author of the gospel and his implied readers. Thus, any examination of the use of Ps 22 in Matthew and Luke's gospels should not be considered as primary evidence that should impact how one interprets the Markan use of the passage. Instead, the content presented in the following chapter will be regarded as additional *support* for the evidence presented; an affirmation of the interpretation independently called upon in the body of the study. As I have proposed a contextual interpretation of Ps 22 in

Mark and presented the evidence in support of this proposal, I will now turn to the PRN of both Matthew and Luke in order to test this thesis.

Chapter 9

Matthew and Luke: Early Readers of Mark's Gospel

Throughout this study I have argued that Mark's implied readers would have recognized his citation of Ps 22:2 in Mark 15:34 as contextual and interpreted it accordingly. This chapter will serve as a "test" for this argument, examining how the writers of the other two synoptic gospels, Matthew and Luke, adopt and adapt Mark's application of Ps 22 to suit their own purposes in their narratives. These gospels have been selected, and other early gospels (John, the Gospel of Peter) have not been selected, for several reasons. First, both John and the Gospel of Peter are considered to be relatively later than Matthew and Luke, dating to the second century rather than the first.⁵⁵⁸ Second, although John makes use of Ps 22 as the other gospels do, there is not as clear a relationship between Mark's gospel and the fourth gospel, hence John's exclusion from the "synoptics." Thus, for our purposes, a discussion of how Matthew and Luke function as Mark's early readers is on much firmer ground.

In doing this case study, I reiterate my adherence to two basic premises which are held by the majority of gospel scholars. The first is that of Markan priority, i. e., that, of the four canonical gospels, Mark was the earliest gospel to be written. The second is that both Matthew and Luke used this first gospel as a resource for their own gospels. Exactly how they used this resource, or in what order they wrote their gospels, is not of importance for my purposes. The key aspect of the relationship between the synoptic gospels (for this study) is that Matthew and Luke, (a) used Mark's gospel as a resource in some manner; and (b) they constitute our earliest tangible readers of Mark, thus serving as the closest examples we now have of Mark's implied readers.⁵⁵⁹

The language I have chosen to use to describe the way Matthew and Luke use Mark's gospel, i. e., the language of "adoption" and "adaptation," is deliberate. It reflects a resistance on my part to assume that the alterations made by Matthew and

⁵⁵⁸ I realize that the dividing line of "first-century texts" and second-century texts" is somewhat superficial, but our limits have to be drawn somewhere! Given the interest of this study in Mark's earliest readers, it seemed fitting to include those from the first century while excluding those from later centuries.

⁵⁵⁹ The relationship between Mark's gospel and the gospel of John is much less clear, and thus will not be included in my test case here.

Luke *necessarily* reflect either, (a) their opinion that Mark's gospel was somehow deficient; or (b) their disagreement with his narrative, views that are at least implicitly held by the majority of synoptic scholars.⁵⁶⁰ Although this may, in some instances, be the case, this is a dangerous assumption to make, as it contributes toward a negative view of Mark as amateur, unsophisticated, and careless (an opinion which was predominant in the twentieth century and is only now slowly becoming less in *vogue*).⁵⁶¹ There are many other reasons why Matthew and Luke might have adapted certain elements of their Markan source. Perhaps some alteration was required in order for a certain passage to fit within their own narrative's agenda. Various changes could also reflect their use of a number of other sources in addition to Mark (Luke 1:1-4). Divergence from their Markan source might also reflect different emphases, both christological and theological. The very fact that both Matthew and Luke use Mark so thoroughly in their own narratives suggests their appreciation and respect for his narration of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection.⁵⁶²

Thus, in this chapter, Matthew and Luke will be regarded as *interpreters* of Mark, rather than mere editors.⁵⁶³ This language avoids any of the negative connotations mentioned above, and serves to remind us that Matthew and Luke were indeed early readers of Mark's gospel, located within communities that read and regarded the gospel as a valuable resource for understanding the person and work of Jesus of Nazareth. In keeping with this view, the purpose of this chapter will not be to emphasize what has been changed or is absent from Mark's narrative in the other gospels, but rather to focus on what is present and important for Matthew and Luke as readers of Mark's gospel, the overlap between Mark and each of the other

⁵⁶⁰ One does not have to look far to find this type of thinking in synoptic scholarship, so much so that it is picked up on and adopted by other scholars in the field. E. g. Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997), 129.

⁵⁶¹ E. g., Karl L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung* (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919). But see Morton S. Enslin, "The Artistry of Mark," *JBL* 66 (1947): 385-99, for an early defense of Mark's literary sophistication.

⁵⁶² Richard C. Beaton, "How Matthew Writes," in *The Written Gospel* (eds. M. Bockmuehl and D. Hagner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 116-34, notes that Matthew's adoption of Mark, and especially *how* he does so, indicates that "he embraces the Marcan tradition and theological commitments (121)."

⁵⁶³ I am not the first to read Matthew and Luke in this way. Both Braumann, "Wozu," 163; and Fowler, *Let the Reader*, 228-60, embrace this view. More will be said concerning Fowler's approach below.

synoptic gospels, and how their use of Mark (and, in our case, their understanding of Mark's use of Ps 22) serves their own portrayal of Jesus.

Robert Fowler has taken a similar approach at the end of his book on Mark and reader-response criticism.⁵⁶⁴ However, my idea for this type of approach in the present chapter was derived independently of Fowler, and his work differs fundamentally from my own in several ways.

First, the scope of this chapter is different than Fowler's project in two key ways. While he deals only with Matthew's reading of Mark, my test case will also include an examination of Luke's reading of Mark. However, while Fowler searches Matthew's gospel for clues to his understanding of certain Markan literary devices (e.g. irony, indirection, and ambiguity) that are found throughout his (Mark's) entire narrative, my study will focus only on the PRNs of the gospels with a view toward their adoption and adaptation of Mark's use of Ps 22 and the Righteous Sufferer language attributed toward Jesus. This limitation is necessary due to the focus of the entire study on Mark's use of Ps 22, and also because of space limitations.

Second, although clearly an improvement upon the predominantly negative view that Matthew and Luke were correcting their Markan source due to its insufficiencies,⁵⁶⁵ overall Fowler still tends to view Matthew's gospel as a polemical response to Mark's gospel. This is evident in his persistent view that first-century readers, including Matthew and Luke, were intent upon "clarifying Mark's ambiguities" and "filling in his gaps."⁵⁶⁶ He also uses language such as "counter" and "supplant" to describe the activities of the second and third gospels.⁵⁶⁷ Moreover, he interprets one of the motivations behind the other gospels' "retelling" of Mark's narrative as dissatisfaction: "that Matthew, Luke, and John undertook to

⁵⁶⁴ Fowler, *Let the Reader*, 228-60.

⁵⁶⁵ He does not regard them as insufficiencies, but rather as sophisticated rhetorical devices that require response on the part of the reader and leave open the possibility for a variety of legitimate readings.

⁵⁶⁶ Fowler, *Let the Reader*, 181.

⁵⁶⁷ Fowler, *Let the Reader*, 62: "One way to counter the effectiveness of a text-fabric is to weave yet another text-fabric that takes up and enfolds its predecessor. Matthew, Luke, and John can be seen as text-fabrics incorporating and thereby supplanting the text-fabric of Mark . . . herein lies the secret of the rhetoric of Matthew, Luke, and John: by reweaving Mark's fabric into their own, they make the original fabric almost invisible, even when it seems to lie separate and distinct right before our eyes." Yet if Mark's text was indeed "supplanted" by the other canonical gospels, how does this hold up to the evidence we have of the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the gospels in the first few centuries of the Christian movement (e. g., the early Christian acceptance of the four-fold gospel)?

retell Mark's story shows how dissatisfied they were with it."⁵⁶⁸ Finally, and perhaps most clearly, Fowler's analogy of Matthew as a "palimpsest" of Mark betrays his regard for Matthew (and Luke) as polemical responses to Mark's narrative.⁵⁶⁹ Since a palimpsest involves the erasure of a previous text and its faint remains (which were intended to be erased *completely*) being covered over by another text, this analogy appears to me to be inadequate and inaccurate when describing the relationship between Matthew (and Luke) and Mark. The fact that both Matthew and Luke adopt so much of Mark's narrative without making significant theological changes suggests that they are including it as part of their own narrative, rather than covering over it entirely with their own (as does a palimpsest).

There are two limitations imposed upon this test case, made necessary by its relationship to my overall thesis and space constraints. The first has been mentioned briefly above. This test case will focus only on Matthew and Luke's adoption and adaptation of Mark's use of Ps 22 and the accompanying Righteous Sufferer language in the PRNs. Since the aim of this study has been to understand how Mark's implied readers in the first century would have read and understood his attribution of the language of Ps 22 to the person of Jesus, this will naturally narrow our focus of the test case to Matthew and Luke's use of Ps 22. Additionally, due to the predominance of these strong allusions and citation in the PRNs in all three gospels, it will be this portion of the narratives that will be examined below. The second limitation is necessary both to the nature of the project as a test case, as well as the space limitations imposed upon this study. The following test case will deal only very minimally with secondary literature. This strategy has much to recommend it, since the aim of the test case is to look upon Matthew and Luke's reading of Mark with "fresh" eyes, rather than provide a detailed exegesis of the passages and/or be preoccupied with maintaining a dialogue with scholarship on matters of interpretation.

The following test case will examine each gospel in turn, focusing on four major points of interest: (1) Is Ps 22:2 cited in this gospel, and, if so, how is it both adopted and adapted from Mark's own use of it?; (2) Are there any overlapping allusions to Ps 22 between this gospel and Mark?; (3) What additional allusions to Ps

⁵⁶⁸ Fowler, *Let the Reader*, 228. He also believes that their retelling of Mark's story in particular suggests the powerful impact of the gospel in the first century.

⁵⁶⁹ E. g., Fowler, *Let the Reader*, 234-35, 248.

22 might be present in this gospel?; and (4) What is the overall use and function of Ps 22 and other Righteous Sufferer language in this gospel, and is how is it similar to and/or different from Mark? The chapter will conclude with some general observations about the knowledge gained concerning Mark's first-century implied readers from this test case of Matthew and Luke.

Test Case: Matthew, Mark, and Ps 22

Matthew also includes the citation of Ps 22:2 by Jesus on the cross (Matt 27:46). Like Mark, this citation constitutes the only words of Jesus uttered during his crucifixion, and is thus a focal point of the account of Jesus' death. Notable differences between the two gospels' citations occur in both the transliterated portion and in the Greek translations provided by the authors. While Mark transliterates the citation as *ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι*, Matthew's is the slightly altered *ηλι ηλι λεμα σαβαχθανι*.⁵⁷⁰ Additionally, in his Greek translation of the citation, Matthew uses the vocative form in Jesus' address to God (Θεέ μου θεέ μου), while Mark has the nominative form (ὁ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου). Matthew also uses the adverb *ινατί*, differing from Mark's use of the preposition plus the interrogative *εις τί*. It is interesting to note that, in the case of the interrogative, Matthew follows the wording of the LXX (OG) more closely than Mark, while Mark parallels the LXX (OG) more closely in the form of the direct address to God. It is unclear what conclusions can be drawn from this observation, save that both writers seem to have made use of the LXX (OG), or a similar version, for their scriptural citation.

It is significant that Matthew retains Mark's citation of Ps 22:2 in his own PRN, especially since the other two gospels fail to include it. This is consistent with the Matthean adoption of the focal point of Jesus' crucifixion (from the beginning to his death, Matt 27:32-50), which follows relatively closely the Markan account (15:21-37).

In following Mark's PRN of Jesus' crucifixion and death, Matthew also includes several of the allusions to Ps 22 present in the former gospel. As in all of the

⁵⁷⁰ For a helpful discussion of the background of each of these, see Williams, "Linguistic Background," 1-12.

gospels,⁵⁷¹ the allusion to the casting of lots for the psalmist's clothing (Ps 22:19) is attributed to the enemies of Jesus in Matt 27:35. Another allusion to Ps 22 present in both Matthew and Mark is the language used to describe the posture of those who pass by the cross (Matt 27:39-40; Mark 15:29). Here both gospels portray these passersby as wagging their heads (κινουῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν) and mocking Jesus (Ps 22:8), with Matthew using verbatim the vocabulary of Mark in the first portion of the allusion (Matt 27:39; Mark 15:29a). Part of that mocking involves their taunt for Jesus to "save himself" (Matt 27:40a), a possible allusion to Ps 22:9 also present in Mark 15:30. Matthew 27:42a also follows Mark's narrative (15:31b) in another allusion to Ps 22:9. In Ps 22 the enemies that surround the psalmist taunt him by mocking his perceived relationship with God, highlighting what they think is his (God's) absence and therefore condemnation of the psalmist because he is not rescued by God. Although in Mark the allusions to Ps 22:9 are apparent only by the overlap of the verb σώζω and a pronoun,⁵⁷² Matthew, while including this allusion (Matt 27:42a), also cites the psalmic verse further in the following verse. The fact that Matthew adds a citation of Ps 22:9 that is absent from Mark 15:30-31 (Matt: πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ῥυσάσθω νῦν εἰ θέλει αὐτόν; LXX Ps 21:9: ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ κύριον ῥυσάσθω αὐτόν σωσάτω αὐτόν ὅτι θέλει αὐτόν) suggests that Matthew saw clearly Mark's allusion to the psalm in this portion of the narrative, and made it stronger by molding the language of his narrative more closely to the scriptures.⁵⁷³ By citing this portion of the psalm, Matthew brings an additional element to the crucifixion scene: the ironic misconception of the relationship between Jesus and God by those who surround him. Like the enemies of the psalmist, they interpret Jesus' predicament and the "silence" from God as a reflection of his own delusion, in this case, that he is God's son (Matt 27:43: εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός.). In Matthew and Mark's PRN, the passersby are not the only ones to insult Jesus. Matthew also adopts Mark's allusion to Ps 22:7 (Matt 27:44; Mark 15:32b), which portrays the two crucified criminals next to Jesus as insulting him (οἱ συσταυρωθέντες/συνεσταυρωμένοι σὺν αὐτῷ ὠνείδιζον αὐτόν). Matthew also retains Mark's account of the "Elijah misunderstanding," which I have argued earlier may

⁵⁷¹ See also Luke 23:34 and John 19:23-24. In John, the reference to Ps 22:19 is a citation rather than an allusion.

⁵⁷² See Chapter 7 of this study.

⁵⁷³ Note that NA²⁷ designates Matthew's use of Ps 22:9 here as a citation rather than an allusion.

be understood as a mocking of the deliverance anticipated by the psalmist in Ps 22:20-22.⁵⁷⁴ Furthermore, Matthew also preserves the Markan account of the centurion's confession (Matt 27:54; Mark 15:39), which I have earlier argued may be considered an allusion to Ps 22:28b.⁵⁷⁵ If this is the case, it may be significant that Matthew increases the number of those who confess Jesus as "son of God" (ὁ δὲ ἑκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ). Perhaps Matthew recognized Mark's allusion to the nations of Ps 22 and strengthened the connection by increasing the number of confessors to reflect a more impressive response to Jesus' death.⁵⁷⁶ Lastly, Matthew's account of the proclamation of Jesus' resurrection (Matt 28:5-8) is an expansion of Mark's own resurrection account, which may be understood as an allusion to the similar event of the psalmist's vindication and the response it invokes in Ps 22:28-32.⁵⁷⁷

I have already highlighted one additional citation to Ps 22 found in Matthew's account of Jesus' crucifixion (Ps 22:9 in Matt 27:34), a citation which appears to be sparked by the previous Markan allusion to Ps 22:9 (Mark 15:31b). There may also be an additional allusion to the psalm not present in Mark's PRN in Matt 27:52-53. These verses contain Matthew's account of tombs being opened, the raising of the dead bodies of saints (πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων), and their subsequent appearances in Jerusalem after Jesus' own resurrection, an episode not recorded in any of the other three gospels. Some have speculated about the influences behind this account (e. g., is it primarily apocalyptic language?) and why Matthew chose to include it when the other gospels writers did not.⁵⁷⁸ Matthew's inclusion of this event may have served several purposes, so that any one interpretation need not be selected to the exclusion of others. Given Matthew's consistent use of Ps 22 throughout his PRN, both in citations and allusions derived

⁵⁷⁴ See Chapter 7 of this study.

⁵⁷⁵ See Chapter 7 of this study.

⁵⁷⁶ Matthew's alteration in the number of those who recognize the identity of Jesus may reflect his understanding of the Markan centurion's confession as sincere, an interpretation for which I have argued previously in Chapter 3 of this study. So also Fowler, *Let the Reader*, 208: "In Matthew . . . not just the centurion but the entire execution squad is 'greatly afraid' when they speak as one voice; they seem too afraid to be mocking, and so they must be speaking sincerely."

⁵⁷⁷ See Chapter 7 of this study.

⁵⁷⁸ E. g. Leopold Sabourin, "Apocalyptic Traits in Matthew's Gospel," *Religious Studies Bulletin* 3 (1983): 19-36; and Ronald D. Witherup, "The Death of Jesus and the Raising of the Saints: Matthew 27:51-54 in Context," *SBLSP* 26 (1987): 574-585.

from Mark's narrative and also in additional references to the psalm, it should not be surprising that this passage may also be an allusion to Ps 22.

A similar incident is anticipated in Ps 22:30, where the psalmist states that, in addition to all the ends of the earth and the nations worshiping God for his mighty act of vindicating the psalmist (Ps 22:28-29), even those who have died will worship him. In Matt 27:52-53, those who were formerly dead are also portrayed as testifying to God's acts in the form of their resurrection and appearance to the living in Jerusalem. From the placement of this incident in Matthew's narrative, it is clear that the reader is meant to understand both Jesus' death and the (God's) tearing of the temple veil and the subsequent earthquake as the catalysts for this resurrection of the saints. On the other hand, ambiguity remains in the narrative as Matthew (a) makes it explicit that at least the appearances of these risen ones do not take place until after Jesus' own resurrection (27:53); and (b) implies that it is this series of events ("the earthquake and the things that happened," τὸν σεισμόν καὶ τὰ γινόμενα) which compel them to confess Jesus' identity (27:54).⁵⁷⁹ The former ambiguity may strengthen the likelihood that this account is to be understood as an allusion to Ps 22, since in both cases the acts of the formerly dead do not take place until the protagonist (the psalmist, Jesus) is vindicated by God. Thus, the order of events in Matthew's PRN follows closely that of Ps 22.

From this brief examination of Matthew's use of Ps 22 in his own PRN, it is clear that he adopted all of the strong allusions and the citation found in Mark's PRN, with minimal alteration. Moreover, it appears that Matthew included at least one additional allusion (Ps 22:30), another citation (Ps 22:9), and strengthened at least one already existing allusion in Mark's PRN (Ps 22:28b). The conclusions to be drawn from these observations is that Matthew fully recognized the importance of Ps 22 in Mark's PRN, and deemed it important enough to expound upon in his own PRN. It is also important to note that two of the three additional elements of Ps 22 in Matthew (above) come from the latter half of the psalm, and are placed within the context of Jesus' *death*. The added emphasis of the vindication of Jesus and its placement in the narrative of his death suggests that Matthew, as an early reader of Mark's gospel, saw in Mark's PRN indications that the larger context of Ps 22 was meant to help interpret and understand Jesus' death. In Matthew's PRN, just as in

⁵⁷⁹ Mark is also ambiguous at this point in his narrative, as it is unclear what sparks the centurion's confession in 15:39, the tearing of the temple veil or the manner in which Jesus dies.

Mark, the intertextual relationship between Ps 22 and the account of Jesus' death serves to highlight his identity as a Righteous Sufferer in the company of others such as the psalmist of Ps 22, who suffers at the hands of his enemies, but anticipates vindication by God via resurrection from the dead. The fact that Jesus is presented as a Righteous Sufferer is even more explicit in Matthew's PRN, as Jesus is called "that righteous man" (τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ) by Pilate's wife in 27:19.⁵⁸⁰

Test Case: Luke, Mark, and Ps 22

Unlike Matthew, Luke does not include in his PRN Jesus' citation of Ps 22:2 which is present in Mark's PRN. He does, however, replace this citation in Matthew and Mark with a citation from another Psalm of the Righteous Sufferer, Ps 31:6 (Luke 23:46). More will be said about the function of this citation and its relationship to the psalmic citation of Matthew and Mark below.

Like Matthew and Mark (and John), Luke also includes the allusion to Ps 22:19 (Luke 23:34), where he identifies those who crucify Jesus as the enemies who divide up the garments of the persecuted one by casting lots for them.⁵⁸¹ Luke also follows Mark in including an allusion to Ps 22:9 in Luke 23:35 (Mark 15:31b). Here again Jesus is taunted to save himself as he has saved others, this being combined with the ridicule of his self-perceived relationship to God as his Christ and Chosen One (ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός). An additional allusion to Ps 22:9 also present in Mark's PRN is placed in Luke on the lips of both the soldiers that surround Jesus (Luke 23:37) and one of the criminals hanging next to him (23:39), where they taunt Jesus to save himself (σῶσον σεαυτόν). Instead of adopting Mark's term for these criminals (ληστές, Mark 15:27), Luke makes a concerted effort to draw an even clearer parallel between the circumstances of the psalmist and Jesus by using the same vocabulary as Symmachus' version of Ps 22:17b in Luke 23:32-33, 39 (κακούργοι, "evil-doers").⁵⁸² Luke, as an early reader of Mark, here shows how he understood Mark by way of his interpretive adaptation. Luke also contains an

⁵⁸⁰ Jesus' condemnation even though he is righteous is contrasted with Pilate's (ironic) self-declared "innocence" (ἄθωός) involving Jesus' death in Matt 27:24.

⁵⁸¹ Luke's narrative is slightly ambiguous at this point, as he never specifies who actually partakes in the casting of lots, while in Matthew and Mark it appears to be the soldiers (Matt 27:27; Mark 15:16).

⁵⁸² Hoffman, "Psalm 22 (LXX 21)," 363, also sees this parallel in Luke.

adapted form of the centurion's confession in Luke 23:47, although the change from "son of God" (υἱὸς θεοῦ, Mark 15:39) to "this man was righteous!" (ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν) might call into question any allusion to Ps 22:28b (the *worship* of the nations). Lastly, Luke's account of Jesus' resurrection and the following proclamation of his vindication by God (Luke 24:5, 8, 33-35) might be regarded as an expansion of Mark's own resurrection account, which may be understood as an allusion to the similar event of the psalmist's vindication and the response it invokes in Ps 22:28-32.⁵⁸³

It is apparent that Luke has not included any strong allusions to Ps 22 other than those already present in the Markan PRN. However, there might be a faint allusion to the end of the psalm (the thanksgiving portion of Ps 22), implicit in Luke's additional narrative of the discussion between Jesus and one of the criminals crucified next to him in Luke 23:42-43. Here the focus of the PRN has shifted from Jesus' impending death to his "coming into his kingdom" (ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου). This discussion of a kingdom is reminiscent of the end of Ps 22, where God's kingdom, which involves the worship of all the earth, is anticipated after the vindication of the psalmist (Ps 22:29).⁵⁸⁴ Perhaps, given the presence of other allusions to Ps 22 sprinkled throughout his PRN, Luke's additional material here is meant to emphasize the importance of the latter half of the psalm in understanding the events surrounding Jesus' death, an emphasis which he derived from Mark's own use of the psalm in his PRN. At the least it shows Luke's anticipation of Jesus' vindication even in the very midst of his death, a further reminder to his readers that the events of Jesus' life did not end at the cross.

I have previously argued that an important function of the allusions and the citation to Ps 22 in Mark's gospel is to present Jesus as the Righteous Sufferer in line with those, including the psalmist, who came before him. This claim is further substantiated by the increased interest of the early Markan reader Luke to portray Jesus as innocent and righteous despite his condemnation to death on a cross. Perhaps more than any other gospel, Jesus' identity as a Righteous Sufferer is made explicit in Luke's PRN.

This continuation of the Righteous Sufferer motif appears in several portions of the Lukan PRN. In Luke 23:41, one of Jesus' fellow criminals rebukes the other

⁵⁸³ See Chapter 7 of this study.

⁵⁸⁴ So also Hoffman, "Psalm 22 (LXX 21)," 363.

for mocking him, noting that they (the criminals) have received the proper punishment for their deeds (he even describes their sentences as “just,” δικάίως), whereas Jesus “did nothing wrong” to deserve his fate (οὗτος δὲ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἔπραξεν.). Thus, Luke contrasts the guilt of the criminals with the innocence of Jesus.

Luke also exchanges one citation of a Psalm of the Righteous Sufferer (Ps 22 in Mark’s PRN) for another when he has Jesus’ last words come from Ps 31:6. It is unclear what motivations lay behind this change,⁵⁸⁵ but it is significant to note that Luke does not just replace this citation from Ps 22 with any words, but rather retains the importance of presenting Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer by placing upon his lips words from another psalm of that category. This may very well indicate Luke’s recognition that the citation of Ps 22 in Mark’s gospel belongs to this motif of the Righteous Sufferer, and may betray his intent to replace it with another of this motif in order to maintain this connection.

Jesus’ identity as a Righteous Sufferer is made most explicit in the Lukan PRN in Luke’s adaptation of the Markan centurion’s confession (Luke 23:47). Rather than calling him “son of God” (υἱὸς θεοῦ, Mark 15:39), Luke’s centurion attests to Jesus’ righteousness (ὅντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν). This constitutes evidence outside of Mark’s gospel that Jesus was seen as a Righteous Sufferer figure, and it ties in closely with the Lukan Jesus’ last words from the cross (Ps 31). This is an important observation, as it shows how Luke was interpreting the reaction of the centurion and the meaning of his confession in Mark’s PRN, as well as the Markan Jesus’ words from the cross in which he cites from a different Psalm of the Righteous Sufferer (Ps 22).

Luke also emphasizes Jesus’ identity as a Righteous Sufferer in the resurrection portion of his PRN. In Luke 24:7 the men at the tomb remind the women of Jesus’ previous words concerning his impending suffering, death, and resurrection as an explanation for the empty tomb. Adapted forms of the Markan passion-resurrection predictions are present in Luke 9:22 (Mark 8:31) and 9:44 (Mark 9:31a), and 24:7 appears to be an amalgamation of the two. I have argued in a previous chapter that Mark’s passion-resurrection predictions serve a dual purpose: to prepare his implied readers to anticipate Jesus’ vindication via resurrection after his suffering

⁵⁸⁵ It is possible that at this early stage the citation from Ps 22 was deemed too harsh or theologically difficult for Christian readers to grasp, but this should not be assumed. It should be remembered that Luke still includes several of the allusions to Ps 22 (and those from the lament portion of the psalm!) in his PRN.

and death, and to identify Jesus' own "story" with the "plot" of the Righteous Sufferers of the past (suffering → vindication). By placing this reminder of Jesus' predictions of his suffering, death, and resurrection in his resurrection narrative, Luke explicitly reminds his readers of the resurrection's existence as a crucial component of the events of Jesus (by having the women reminded of this foreshadowing within the narrative). In addition to the previous indications that Luke understands Jesus to be a Righteous Sufferer, the fact that, within the reiteration of the passion-resurrection prediction in Luke 24:7, those who are responsible for Jesus' death are called "sinful men" (ἀνθρώπων ἁμαρτωλῶν) implies a contrast between these persecutors and the sinless Jesus.

Moreover, in the midst of his account of Jesus' resurrection appearances, the Lukan Jesus explicitly links his suffering and resurrection with the fulfillment of scripture, of which he includes the psalms (Luke 24:44-47). This is yet another close link between the psalms used in Luke (some derived from Mark) and the fate of Jesus in his suffering, death, and resurrection that is clothed in Righteous Sufferer language.⁵⁸⁶

Despite the absence of the citation of Ps 22:2 in Luke's PRN, it is clear that, as an early reader of Mark's gospel, Luke adopts and adapts much of the psalmic and Righteous Sufferer language in his own portrayal of Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection. In addition to including most of the Markan strong allusions to Ps 22 in his own PRN, Luke emphasizes the link between Jesus and the motif of the Righteous Sufferer through explicit language not present in the Markan PRN. The fact that Luke does use adapted Markan language to achieve this, however, suggests that his portrayal of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer was influenced by Mark's portrayal of Jesus.

Conclusions

What has been learned from our examination of Matthew and Luke as early interpreters of Mark's use of Ps 22 in his PRN? It has become clear that both

⁵⁸⁶ Morna D. Hooker, "Beginnings and Endings," in *The Written Gospel* (eds. M. Bockmuehl and D. A. Hagner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 184-202, believes this to reflect the early Christian community's understanding of the Jesus events in light of scripture: "... it is clear that they [these statements of Jesus] reflect the growing awareness of the Christian community that the story of Jesus' life, death and resurrection corresponded to particular passages in scripture" (198).

Matthew and Luke include many of the Markan allusions to Ps 22 and, in the case of Matthew, the citation of Ps 22:2. The chart below provides a synopsis of the presence of Ps 22 in all three gospels.

Key: (c) = citation; (sa) = strong allusion; (fa) = faint allusion

	Mark	Matthew	Luke
Ps 22:2	15:34 (c)	27:46 (c)	-----
Ps 22:19	15:24b (sa)	27:35 (sa)	23:34 (sa)
Ps 22:8	15:29 (sa)	27:39 (sa)	-----
Ps 22:9	15:30-31b (sa)	27:40, 42a (sa); 27:43 (c)	23:35, 37, 39 (sa)
Ps 22:7	15:32b (sa)	27:44 (sa)	-----
Ps 22:17	15:27 (fa)	-----	23:32-33, 39 (fa)
Ps 22:20-22a	15:35-36 (fa)	27:47-49 (fa)	-----
Ps 22:30	-----	27:52-53 (fa)	-----
Ps 22:28b	15:39 (fa)	27:54 (fa)	23:47 (fa?)
Ps 22:29	15:43 (fa)	-----	23:42-43, 50-51 (fa)
Ps 22:28-32	16:6, 7 (fa)	28:5-8	24:5, 8, 33-35 (fa)

Has this test case produced the results for which I have argued throughout my study? Do the PRNs of Matthew and Luke, as products of two early implied readers of Mark's gospel, confirm or disconfirm my thesis that Mark's earliest readers would have recognized the citation of Ps 22:2 as contextual and interpreted it accordingly? Several results of this test case confirm the argument of this study.

In the case of Matthew, not only does he adopt all of the strong allusions and the citation to Ps 22 present in the Markan PRN, but he also adds a citation and an allusion, and strengthens another existing one. Moreover, two of the three additions come from the latter half of the psalm, which indicates that Matthew did indeed interpret Jesus' death in light of the entire psalm. Matthew also makes explicit the portrayal of Jesus as a Righteous Sufferer by attesting to his righteousness in Matt 27:19.

Similarly, Luke adopts much of the Markan language of Ps 22 in his PRN. Although he does not include the citation of Ps 22:2 by Jesus, he does alter the citation by substituting it with another citation from a Psalm of the Righteous Sufferer. This indicates that he recognized this link between the two psalms and deemed it appropriate to adapt Mark 15:34 accordingly. Most importantly, however, Luke significantly increases the explicit Righteous Sufferer language throughout his entire PRN, both in the account of Jesus' crucifixion and also in the account of the resurrection and the subsequent appearances.

Thus, it seems that both Matthew and Luke function somewhat differently to substantiate my thesis argument (that Mark's early implied readers would have read and understood Ps 22 as contextual). Matthew clearly adds references to Ps 22 not present in Mark, which indicates that he read the Markan citation of Ps 22:2 as contextual. The fact that two of these allusions are derived from the latter half of the psalm further substantiates this claim. It is Matthew's direct use of Ps 22, therefore, which provides additional external support for my interpretation of Mark 15:34. Luke's use of Ps 22, on the other hand, does not follow Mark as closely as Matthew. Yet he clearly recognizes and adopts the Markan emphasis on the Righteous Sufferer identity of Jesus, an identity which I have argued is implicit in the Markan PRN, precisely in his use of Ps 22 (among other things). By the inclusion of explicit Righteous Sufferer language, it is apparent that Luke recognized what was implicit in Mark via his use of Ps 22 and used additional means by which to emphasize this motif.

Matthew and Luke, as our earliest tangible readers of Mark's gospel, constitute two key examples of how Mark was read and interpreted in the first century CE. It has been the task of this chapter to examine these two texts to see how they adopt and adapt Mark's use of Ps 22 in the hopes of confirming the thesis of this study. The evidence presented above appears to be further support that Mark's early readers would indeed have interpreted the Markan Jesus' citation of Ps 22:2 contextually.

Appendix A

MT Psalm 22

- ¹ לִמְנַצֵּחַ עַל־אֵילַת הַשָּׁחַר מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד:
² אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהֵי לָמָּה עֲזַבְתָּנִי רְחוֹק מִיִּשְׁוּעָתִי דְּבַרִּי שְׁאֲנָתִי:
³ אֱלֹהֵי אֲקָרָא יוֹמָם וְלַיְלָה תַעֲנֶה וְלֵילָה וְלֹא־דוֹמִיָּה לִי:
⁴ וְאַתָּה קְדוֹשׁ יוֹשֵׁב תְּהִלּוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל:
⁵ בְּךָ בָטְחוּ אֲבֹתֵינוּ בָטְחוּ וַתִּפְלֹטֵמוּ:
⁶ אֱלֹהֵי זַעֲקוּ וְנִמְלָטוּ בְּךָ בָטְחוּ וְלֹא־בוֹשׁוּ:
⁷ וְאַנְכִי תוֹלַעַת וְלֹא־אִישׁ חֲרַפְתָּ אָדָם וּבְזוֹי עָם:
⁸ כָּל־רֹאֵי יִלְעָנוּ לִי יִפְטִירוּ בְשָׁפָה יִנְיֵעוּ רֹאשׁ:
⁹ גַּל אֶל־יְהוָה יִפְלֹטֵהוּ יִצִּילֵהוּ כִּי חָפֵץ בּוֹ:
¹⁰ כִּי־אַתָּה גָּחִי מִבָּטָן מִבְּטִיחִי עַל־שָׁרֵי אֲמִי:
¹¹ עָלֶיךָ הִשְׁלַכְתִּי מִרְחֹם מִבָּטָן אֲמִי אֱלֹהֵי אָתָּה:
¹² אֶל־תִּרְחֹק מִמֶּנִּי כִּי־צָרָה קְרוֹבָה כִּי־אֵין עֹזֶר:
¹³ סָבִיבוּנִי פָרִים רַבִּים אֲבִירִי בָשָׁן כְּתֹרֵנִי:
¹⁴ פָּצוּ עָלַי פִּיהֶם אֲרִיָּה טָרֵף וְשֹׁאֵג:
¹⁵ כַּמִּים נִשְׁפָּכְתִּי וְהִתְפָּרְדּוּ כָּל־עַצְמוֹתַי הִיָּה לִבִּי כְּדוֹנָג
נָמַס בְּתוֹךְ מַעֵי:
¹⁶ יָבֵשׁ כַּחֲרֹשׁ כָּחִי וְלִשׁוֹנִי מִדְּבָק מִלְּקוֹחִי וְלַעֲפָר־מוֹת
תִּשְׁפָּתֵנִי:
¹⁷ כִּי סָבִיבוּנִי כָּלִבִּים עֲדַת מְרַעִים הַקִּיפוּנִי כָּאִי יָדַי וְרַגְלִי:
¹⁸ אֲסַפֵּר כָּל־עַצְמוֹתַי הֵמָּה יִבִּיטוּ יִרְאוּ־בִי:
¹⁹ יִחַלְקוּ בְּגִדִי לָהֶם וְעַל־לְבוּשִׁי יִפִּילוּ גֹרָל:
²⁰ וְאַתָּה יְהוָה אֶל־תִּרְחֹק אֵילֹהֵי לְעֹזְרָתִי חוֹשָׁה:
²¹ הִצִּילָה מִחֲרַב נַפְשִׁי מִיַּד־כָּלִב יַחֲדָתִי:
²² הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי מִפִּי אֲרִיָּה וּמִקֶּרְנֵי רַמִּים עֲנִיתֵנִי:
²³ אֲסַפְּרָה שִׁמְךָ לְאַחִי בְּתוֹךְ קִהְל אֶהְלֵלָךְ:
²⁴ יִרְאֵי יְהוָה הִלְלוּהוּ כָּל־זֶרַע יַעֲקֹב כִּבְדּוּהוּ וְגִירוּ מִמֶּנּוּ
כָּל־זֶרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל:
²⁵ כִּי לֹא־בִזָּה וְלֹא שִׁלְץ עָנֹת עָנִי וְלֹא־הִסְתִּיר פָּנָיו מִמֶּנּוּ
וּבִשְׁוֹעוֹ אֱלֹהֵי שָׁמַע:
²⁶ מֵאֲתָךְ תִּהְלָתִי בְּקִהְל רַב נְדָרֵי אֲשֶׁלֶם נִגְדַּי יִרְאִיו:
²⁷ יֹאכְלוּ עַנּוּיִם וְיִשְׁבְּעוּ יִהְלְלוּ יְהוָה דְּרֹשְׁיוּ יַחֲי לְבַבְכֶּם

לְעֵד:²⁸
 יִזְכְּרוּ וַיֵּשְׁבוּ אֶל־יְהוָה כָּל־אֲפִסֵּי־אֶרֶץ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ לְפָנָיִךְ
 כָּל־מִשְׁפְּחוֹת גּוֹיִם:²⁹
 כִּי לַיהוָה הַמְּלוּכָה וּמִשַּׁל בַּגּוֹיִם:³⁰
 אָכְלוּ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ כָּל־דְּשֵׁי־אֶרֶץ לְפָנָיו יִכְרְעוּ כָּל־יִירָדִי
 עֹפֶר וְנֶפֶשׁ לֹא חִיָּה:³¹
 זֶרַע יַעֲבֹדֵנוּ יִסְפֹּר לְאֹדְנִי לְדֹר:³²
 יִבְאוּ וַיִּגִּידוּ צְדָקָתוֹ לְעַם נֹלֵד כִּי עָשָׂה:

¹ For the director, upon the hind of the dawn;

A melody with respect to David.

² My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?

Far from my salvation are the words of my distress.

³ God, I cry out by day but you do not answer,

and at night but I receive no repose.

⁴ But you are holy,

inhabiting the praises of Israel.

⁵ In you our fathers trusted;

they trusted and you delivered them.

⁶ To you they cried out and escaped;

in you they trusted and were not ashamed.

⁷ But I am a worm and not a man;

a reproach of mankind and a scorn of the people.

⁸ All who see me mock me;

they separate with their lips, they shake their heads.

⁹ “Commit to the Lord; let him deliver him;

let him rescue him for he delights in him!”

¹⁰ For you brought me forth from the womb;

you caused me to trust while upon my mother’s breasts.

- ¹¹ Upon you I was cast from birth;
from my mother's womb you have been my God.
- ¹² Do not be far from me for distress is near,
for there is no one to help.
- ¹³ Many bulls surround me;
mighty bulls of Bashan encircle me.
- ¹⁴ They open their mouths against me,
like a lion who tears and roars.
- ¹⁵ I am poured out like water and all my bones are divided.
My heart has become like wax; it is melted within my belly.
- ¹⁶ My strength is dried up like a potsherd and my tongue clings to my jaw,
and you place me in the dust of death.
- ¹⁷ For dogs surround me,
a pack of evildoers encompasses me.
They dig at my hands and my feet.
- ¹⁸ I count all of my bones.
They look; they gaze at me.
- ¹⁹ They divide my garments for themselves,
and upon my clothing they cast lots.
- ²⁰ But you, O Lord, do not be distant!
O my Help, to my assistance make haste!
- ²¹ Rescue my soul from the sword;
my only soul from the hand of the dog!
- ²² Deliver me from the mouth of the lion!
Now from the horns of the wild oxen you answer me!
- ²³ I will tell of your name to my brothers;
in the midst of the congregation I will praise you.

- ²⁴ Those who fear the Lord, praise him, all you descendants of Jacob, honor him;
and stand in awe of him, all you descendants of Israel.
- ²⁵ For he does despise nor detest the affliction of the afflicted,
and does not hide his face from him.
When he cries out to him, he hears.
- ²⁶ From you comes my praise in the great congregation.
I will repay my vows in front of those who fear him.
- ²⁷ The afflicted will eat and be satisfied.
The ones who seek him will praise the Lord.
Let your heart live forever!
- ²⁸ All the ends of the earth will remember and turn back to the Lord,
and all the clans of the nations will bow down in your presence.
- ²⁹ For kingship belongs to the Lord,
and he rules among the nations.
- ³⁰ All the fat ones of the earth will eat and bow down in his presence;
all who descend to the dust will bow down,
and his soul will not be preserved.
- ³¹ Offspring will serve him;
It will be recounted for the Lord to the generation.
- ³² They will come and declare his righteousness
to a people yet to be born,
for he has done it.

Appendix B

LXX Psalm 21

- ¹ εἰς τὸ τέλος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀντιλήμψεως τῆς ἑωθινῆς ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ
- ² ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός μου πρόσχες μοι ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς σωτηρίας μου οἱ λόγοι τῶν παραπτωμάτων μου
- ³ ὁ θεός μου κεκραῶμαι ἡμέρας καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούσῃ καὶ νυκτός καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἄνοιαν ἐμοί
- ⁴ σὺ δὲ ἐν ἁγίοις κατοικεῖς ὁ ἔπαινος Ἰσραὴλ
- ⁵ ἐπὶ σοὶ ἤλπισαν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἤλπισαν καὶ ἐρρύσω αὐτούς
- ⁶ πρὸς σὲ ἐκέκραξαν καὶ ἐσώθησαν ἐπὶ σοὶ ἤλπισαν καὶ οὐ κατησχύνθησαν
- ⁷ ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι σκώληξ καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ὄνειδος ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἐξουδένημα λαοῦ
- ⁸ πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντές με ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν
- ⁹ ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ κύριον ῥυσάσθω αὐτόν σωσάτω αὐτόν ὅτι θέλει αὐτόν
- ¹⁰ ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐκσπάσας με ἐκ γαστροῦ ἡ ἐλπίς μου ἀπὸ μαστῶν τῆς μητρός μου
- ¹¹ ἐπὶ σὲ ἐπερρίφην ἐκ μήτρας ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου θεός μου εἶ σύ
- ¹² μὴ ἀποστῆς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ὅτι θλίψις ἐγγύς ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ βοηθῶν
- ¹³ περιέκυκλωσάν με μόσχοι πολλοὶ ταῦροι πίονες περιέσχον με
- ¹⁴ ἤνοιξαν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ὡς λέων ὁ ἀρπάζων καὶ ὠρυόμενος
- ¹⁵ ὡσεὶ ὕδωρ ἐξεχύθη καὶ διεσκορπίσθη πάντα τὰ ὀστέα μου ἐγενήθη ἡ καρδιά μου ὡσεὶ κηρὸς τηκόμενος ἐν μέσῳ τῆς κοιλίας μου
- ¹⁶ ἐξηράνθη ὡς ὄστρακον ἡ ἰσχὺς μου καὶ ἡ γλῶσσά μου κεκόλληται τῷ λάρυγγί μου καὶ εἰς χοῦν θανάτου κατήγαγές με
- ¹⁷ ὅτι ἐκύκλωσάν με κύνες πολλοὶ συναγωγὴ πονηρευομένων περιέσχον με ὥρυξαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας
- ¹⁸ ἐξηρίθμησα πάντα τὰ ὀστέα μου αὐτοὶ δὲ κατεινόησαν καὶ ἐπεῖδόν με

¹⁹ διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον
²⁰ σὺ δὲ κύριε μὴ μακρύνῃς τὴν βοήθειάν μου εἰς τὴν ἀντίλημψίν μου πρόσχες
²¹ ῥῦσαι ἀπὸ ῥομφαίας τὴν ψυχὴν μου καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς κυνὸς τὴν μονογενῇ μου
²² σῶσόν με ἐκ στόματος λέοντος καὶ ἀπὸ κεράτων μονοκερώτων τὴν ταπείνωσίν μου
²³ διηγῆσμαι τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε
²⁴ οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον αἰνέσατε αὐτόν ἅπαν τὸ σπέρμα Ἰακωβ δοξάσατε αὐτόν
φοβηθήτωσαν αὐτόν ἅπαν τὸ σπέρμα Ἰσραὴλ
²⁵ ὅτι οὐκ ἐξουδένωσεν οὐδὲ προσώχθισεν τῇ δεήσει τοῦ πτωχοῦ οὐδὲ ἀπέστρεψεν
τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ κεκραγέναι με πρὸς αὐτόν εἰσήκουσέν μου
²⁶ παρὰ σοῦ ὁ ἔπαινός μου ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ μεγάλῃ τὰς εὐχὰς μου ἀποδώσω ἐνώπιον
τῶν φοβουμένων αὐτόν
²⁷ φάγονται πένητες καὶ ἐμπλησθήσονται καὶ αἰνέσουσιν κύριον οἱ ἐκζητοῦντες
αὐτόν ζήσονται αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος
²⁸ μνησθήσονται καὶ ἐπιστραφήσονται πρὸς κύριον πάντα τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς καὶ
προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν
²⁹ ὅτι τοῦ κυρίου ἡ βασιλεία καὶ αὐτὸς δεσπόζει τῶν ἐθνῶν
³⁰ ἔφαγον καὶ προσεκύνησαν πάντες οἱ πόινες τῆς γῆς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ προπεσοῦνται
πάντες οἱ καταβαίνοντες εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μου αὐτῷ ζῇ
³¹ καὶ τὸ σπέρμα μου δουλεύσει αὐτῷ ἀναγγελήσεται τῷ κυρίῳ γενεὰ ἡ ἐρχομένη
³² καὶ ἀναγγελοῦσιν τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ λαῷ τῷ τεχνησομένῳ ὅτι ἐποίησεν ὁ
κύριος

¹ Concerning the end, for the helper of the early morning;

A psalm by David.

² God, my God, pay attention to me; why did you forsake me?

Far from my salvation are the words of my trespasses.

³ My God, I will cry out by day and you will not hear,

and by night and you will not listen to my folly.

- ⁴ But you dwell among the holy ones,
the praise of Israel.
- ⁵ Upon you our fathers hoped;
they hoped and you delivered them.
- ⁶ To you they cried out and were saved;
upon you they hoped and were not disappointed.
- ⁷ But I am a worm and not a man.
A reproach of mankind and an object of contempt of people.
- ⁸ All those who see me mock me;
they talk with their lips, they shake their head.
- ⁹ “He hoped upon the Lord, let him deliver him;
let him save him, since he delights in him.”
- ¹⁰ But you are the one who drew me out from the womb;
my hope from my mother’s breast.
- ¹¹ Upon you I have been placed from the womb;
from my mother’s belly you have been my God.
- ¹² Do not depart from me because suffering is near,
since there is no help.
- ¹³ Many bulls encircled me;
fat bulls surrounded me.
- ¹⁴ They opened their mouths at me,
the ones who attack and roar like a lion.
- ¹⁵ I have been poured out like water and all my bones have been separated.
My heart has become like wax melting in the middle of my belly.
- ¹⁶ My strength has been dried out like a potsherd and my tongue has been joined to
my throat,
and you have brought me down into the dust of death.

- ¹⁷ Because many dogs encircled me, a congregation of evildoers surrounded me.
They dug at my hands and feet.
- ¹⁸ I counted all of my bones.
But they looked and took notice of me.
- ¹⁹ They divided my clothes for themselves
and upon my clothing they cast lots.
- ²⁰ But you, O Lord, do not prolong my help,
as my Helper, pay close attention!
- ²¹ Rescue my soul from the sword
and my only soul from the hand of the dog!
- ²² Save me from the mouth of the lion,
and from the mighty horn, my humiliation.
- ²³ I will tell of your name to my brothers.
In the great assembly I will sing your praises.
- ²⁴ Those who fear the Lord, praise him! All the seed of Jacob, glorify him!
Fear him, all the seed of Israel!
- ²⁵ Because it has not been in vain nor has he been angry towards the prayer of the
poor,
nor has he turned his presence from me, and among my cries to him he has
listened to me.
- ²⁶ From you is my praise in the great assembly.
I will repay my vows in the presence of those who fear him.
- ²⁷ The poor will eat and be satisfied and those who seek him will praise the Lord.
Their hearts will live forever.
- ²⁸ All the ends of the earth will remember and turn back to the Lord,
and all the families of the nations will bow down before you.
- ²⁹ Because the kingdom is the Lord's

and he has dominion over the nations.

³⁰ All the fat ones of the earth will eat and bow down before him.

All those who descend into the earth will fall prostrate,

and my soul lives in him.

³¹ And my seed will serve him;

the coming generation will report of the Lord.

³² And they will report of his righteousness to a people to be born,

because the Lord has done it.

Works Cited

- Ahearne-Kroll, Stephen. "The Suffering of David and the Suffering of Jesus: The Use of Four Psalms of Individual Lament in the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of Mark." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2005.
- Aichele, George, and Gary A. Phillips. "Introduction: Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis." *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 7-18.
- Aitken, Ellen Bradshaw. *Jesus' Death in Early Christian Memory: The Poetics of the Passion*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 53. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- Aland, Kurt. "Bemerkungen zum Schluss des Markusevangeliums." Pages 157-80 in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*. Edited by E.E. Ellis, and M. Wilcox. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969.
- Albright, William F. "A Catalog of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23 (1950-51): 1-39.
- Alexander, Loveday. "The Four among Pagans." Pages 222-37 in *The Written Gospel*. Edited by M. Bockmuehl and D. Hagner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Alexander, Patrick H., et al, eds. *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Allegro, John M. *Qumran Cave 4: I (4Q158-4Q186)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Allen, Leslie C. *Psalms 101-150*. Word Biblical Commentary 21. Waco: Word Books, 1983.
- Allison, Dale C. *The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1985.

- . *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981.
- Ambrose. *Of the Christian Faith*. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* 2. Edited by P. Schaff. New York: Christian Literature, 1887-1894. Reprint, Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Anderson, Hugh. "The Old Testament in Mark's Gospel." Pages 280-306 in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*. Edited by J. M. Efird. Durham: Duke University Press, 1972.
- Annen, Franz. *Heil für die Heiden: Zur Bedeutung und Geschichte der Tradition vom bessessenen Gerasener (Mk 5,1-20 parr.)*. Frankfurter theologische Studien 20. Frankfurt am Main: Joseph Knecht, 1976.
- Augustine. *The Letters of St. Augustine*. Pages ____ in *Fathers of the Church: A New Translation* 20. Edited by R. J. Deferrari. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947-.
- Barker, Margaret. "Resurrection: Reflections on a New Approach." Pages 98-105 in *Resurrection*. Edited by S. E. Porter, M. A. Hayes, and D. Tombs. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 186. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1999.
- Bauckham, Richard. *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998.
- Bauer, Johannes B. "Drei Tage." *Biblica* 39 (1958): 354-58.
- Bayer, Hans F. *Jesus' Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection: The Provenance, Meaning, and Correlation of the Synoptic Predictions*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/20 Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986.
- Beaton, Richard C. "How Matthew Writes." Pages 116-34 in *The Written Gospel*. Edited by M. Bockmuehl and D. Hagner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

- Beavis, Mary Ann. *Mark's Audience: The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4.11-12*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 33. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Bennett, W. J., Jr. "The Son of Man Must . . ." *Novum Testamentum* 17 (1975): 113-29.
- Best, Ernest. *The Temptation and the Passion*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 2. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Blackburn, Barry. *Theios Anēr and the Markan Miracle Traditions: A Critique of the Theios Anēr Concept as an Interpretative Background of the Miracle Traditions Used by Mark*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/40. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Bond, Helen K. *Caiaphas: Friend of Rome and Judge of Jesus?* Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2004.
- Bowman, John W. *The Gospel of Mark: The Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah*. Studia Postbiblica 8. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Braumann, Georg. "Wozu (Mk 15:34)." Pages 155-65 in *Theokratia: Jahrbuch Des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum II 1970-1972, Festgabe Für Karl Heinrich Rengstorf Zum 70*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah—from Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Buchanan, George. *Introduction to Intertextuality*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1994.

- Bultmann, Rudolph. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by J. Marsh. 2d ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.
- Burchard, Christoph. "Introduction to *Joseph and Aseneth*." Pages 177-201 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983.
- . "Markus 15:34." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 74 (1983): 1-11.
- Burridge, Richard A. "Who Writes, Why, and for Whom?." Pages 99-115 in *The Written Gospel*. Edited by M. Bockmuehl and D. Hagner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Byrskog, Samuel. *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism, and the Matthean Community*. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 24. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1994.
- Campbell, William S. "'Why Did You Abandon Me?' Abandonment Christology in Mark's Gospel." Paper presented at the annual meeting for the Society of Biblical Literature. San Antonio, TX, November 22, 2004.
- Carey, Holly J. "Teachings and Tirades: Jesus' Temple Act and His Teachings in Mark 11:15-19." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 10:1 (2007): 93-105.
- Caza, Lorraine. *Mon Dieu, pourquoi m'as-tu abandonné?* Recherches Nouvelle Série 24. Montréal: Bellarmin, 1989.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Introduction to *Odes of Solomon*." Pages 725-34 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983.
- . "Jewish Hymns, Odes, and Prayers (Ca. 167 B.C.E.-135 C.E.)." Pages 411-36 in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by R. A. Kraft and G. W. E. Nickelsburg. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Chronis, Harry L. "The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15:37-39." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 97-114.

- Cohn-Sherbok, Dan. "Jesus' Cry on the Cross: An Alternative View." *Expository Times* 93 (1982): 215-17.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Appropriation of the Psalms of Individual Lament by Mark." Pages 223-41 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Coombs, James H. "Allusion Defined and Explained." *Poetics* 13 (1984): 475-88.
- Cranfield, Charles E. B. "A Study of St. Mark 1.9-11." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 8 (1955): 53-63.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. "Miriam." Pages 566-67 in vol.1 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Culler, Jonathan. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1981.
- Danby, Herbert. *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1933.
- Danker, Frederick W. "Demonic Secret in Mark: A Reexamination of the Cry of Dereliction." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 61 (1970): 48-69.
- Davies, Philip R. *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Brown Judaic Studies 94. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Davis, Philip G. "Mark's Christological Paradox." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 35 (1989): 3-18.
- de Waard, Jan. *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 4. Leiden: Brill, 1965.

- Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Contributions to the Study of the Gerasene Demoniac." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 3 (1979): 2-17.
- . *The Making of Mark: The Scriptural Bases of the Earliest Gospel*. 2 vols. Shipston-on-Stour: P. Drinkwater, 1985.
- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by B. Woolf. London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1934.
- Dillon, Richard J. "The Psalms of the Suffering Just in the Accounts of Jesus' Passion." *Worship* 61 (1987): 430-40.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet & Co., 1952.
- Donahue, John R. "From Passion Traditions to Passion Narrative." Pages 1-20 in *The Passion in Mark*. Edited by W. Kelber. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Draisma, Sipke., ed. *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*. Kampen: Kok, 1989.
- Enslin, Morton. "The Artistry of Mark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 66 (1947): 385-99.
- . *The Prophet from Nazareth*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Evans, Craig A. "Did Jesus Predict His Death and Resurrection?." Pages 82-97 in *Resurrection*. Edited by S. E. Porter, M. A. Hayes, and D. Tombs. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 186. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- . "How Septuagintal is Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9?." *Novum Testamentum* 45 (2003): 105-10.
- . "Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 237-70.

———. *Mark 8:27-16:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 34B. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001.

Falk, Daniel K. "Qumran and the Synagogue Liturgy." Pages 404-34 in *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E.: Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001*. Edited by B. Olsson, and M. Zetterholm. Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 39. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003.

Feldmeier, Reinhard. *Die Krisis des Gottessohnes: Die Gethsemaneerzählung als Schlüssel der Markuspassion*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/21. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.

Fisher, Loren. "Betrayed by Friends: An Expository Study of Psalm 22." *Interpretation* 18 (1964): 20-38.

Foster, Paul. "The Use of Zechariah in Matthew's Gospel." Pages 65-85 in *The Book of Zechariah and Its Influence*. Edited by C. Tuckett. Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 2003.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock, 1972.

Fowler, Robert M. *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Geddert, Timothy J. *Watchwords: Mark 13 in Markan Eschatology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

Gese, Hartmut. "Psalm 22 und das Neue Testament: Der älteste Bericht vom Tode Jesu und die Entstehung des Herrenmahles." Pages 180-201 in *Vom Sinai zum Zion*. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 64. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1974.

Gnilka, Joachim. *Jesu ipsissima mors: Der Tod Jesu im Lichte seiner Martyriumsparänese*. Eichstätter Hochschulreden 38. Munich: Minerva, 1983.

Gould, Ezra P. *The Gospel According to Mark*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1896.

Gray, John R. "A Cantata of the Autumn Festival: Psalm LXVIII." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 22 (1977): 2-26.

Green, Joel B. "Death of Jesus." Pages 146-63 in vol. 1 of *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by J. B. Green and S. McKnight. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992.

Greig, James C. G. "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Qumran Community." *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955): 119-26.

Guelich, Robert A. "The Beginning of the Gospel: Mark 1:1-15." *Biblical Research* 27 (1982): 5-15.

Gundry, Robert H. *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1993.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Die Psalmen*. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.

Ham, Clay A. *The Coming King and the Rejected Shepherd: Matthew's Reading of Zechariah's Messianic Hope*. New Testament Monographs 4. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2005.

Hanson, Anthony T. *The Living Utterances of God: The New Testament Exegesis of the Old*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983.

- Hasenzahl, Walter. *Die Gottverlassenheit des Christus nach dem Kreuzeswort bei Matthäus und Markus und das christologische Verständnis des griechischen Psalters*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie 39. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1937.
- Hatina, Thomas R. *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 232. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- . "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?." *Biblical Interpretation* 7 (1999): 28-43.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- . *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997.
- Hays, Richard B., and Joel B. Green. "The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers." Pages 222-38 in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Edited by J. B. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1981.
- . "Eye-Witness Memory and the Writing of the Gospels." Pages 70-96 in *The Written Gospel*. Edited by M. Bockmuehl and D. Hagner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1985.
- Hermerén, Göran. "Allusions and Intensions." Pages 203-20 in *Intention and Interpretation*. Edited by G. Iseminger. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992.
- Hinds, Stephen. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

- Hippolytus, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*. Translated by B. S. Easton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.
- Hoffman, Mark G. V. "Psalm 22 (LXX 21) and the Crucifixion of Jesus." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1996.
- Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Holst, Robert. "The 'Cry of Dereliction' - Another Point of View." *Springfielder* 35 (1972): 286-9.
- Hooker, Morna D. "Beginnings and Endings." Pages 184-202 in *The Written Gospel*. Edited by M. Bockmuehl, and D. A. Hagner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . "Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?." Pages 155-68 in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*. Edited by E. Best and R. M. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- . *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. Black's New Testament Commentaries 2. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1991.
- . *The Son of Man in Mark*. London: SPCK, 1967.
- . "Traditions About the Temple in the Sayings of Jesus." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 70 (1988): 7-20.
- Hunter, A. M. *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM Press, 1948.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . *Mark*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament 2. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1983.

———. "The Women, the Tomb, and the Climax of Mark." *forthcoming*.

Incigneri, Brian J. *The Gospel to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel*. Biblical Interpretation Series 65. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Jauss, Hans R. *Towards an Aesthetic of Reception*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Jeremias, Gert. *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.

Johnson, Earl S., Jr. "Is Mark 15.39 the Key to Mark's Christology?." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31 (1987): 3-22.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. "The Scriptural World of Hebrews." *Interpretation* 57 (2003): 237-50.

Jokiranta, Jutta. "The Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim: A Social Identity Approach." Pages 254-63 in *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in Its Social Context*. Edited by P. F. Esler. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.

Juel, Donald H. *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 31. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977.

———. *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1985.

Kee, Howard C. *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977.

———. "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16." Pages 165-88 in *Jesus und Paulus*. Edited by E. Grässer and E. E. Ellis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Kelber, Werner. *The Oral and Written Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Kenneally, William J. "Eli, Eli, Lema Sabactani' (Mt 27:46)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 8 (1946): 124-34.

Kim, Tae Hun. "The Anarthrous *ὁὶς θεοῦ* in Mark 15, 39 and the Roman Imperial Cult." *Biblica* 79 (1998): 221-41.

Kinukawa, Hisako. *Women and Jesus in Mark: A Japanese Feminist Perspective*. Marykoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1994.

Kittel, G., and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

Klein, Ralph W. *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: From the Septuagint to Qumran*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Kloppenborg, John S. "Egyptian Viticultural Practices and the Citation of Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9." *Novum Testamentum* 44 (2002): 134-59.

———. "Isa 5:1-7 LXX and Mark 12:1,9, Again." *Novum Testamentum* 46 (2004): 12-19.

Knohl, Israel. *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by D. Maisel. Berkley: University of California Press, 2000.

Kristeva, Julia. *Séméiotiké: recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Points, 1969.

- Lane, William L. *The Gospel According to Mark*. New London Commentary on the New Testament. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1974.
- Lange, Harvey D. "The Relationship between Psalm 22 and the Passion Narrative." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 43 (1972): 610-21.
- . "A Study of the Hermeneutical Principles Involved in the Interpretation and Use of Psalm 22 in Biblical and Extrabiblical Sources." Ph. D. diss., Concordia Seminary, 1970.
- Leddy, Michael. "The Limits of Allusion." *The British Journal of Aesthetics* 32 (1992): 110-23.
- Lim, Timothy H. "The Wicked Priest or the Liar?." Pages 45-51 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*. Edited by T.H. Lim. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM Press LTD, 1961.
- Linnemann, Eta. *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- MacDonald, Dennis R. *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Mack, Burton L. *A Myth of Innocence*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Mann, C. S. *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 27. New York: Doubleday, 1986.
- Marcus, Joel. "The Old Testament and the Death of Jesus: The Role of Scripture in the Gospel Passion Narratives." Pages 205-33 in *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity*. Edited by J. T. Carroll and J. B. Green. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1995.

———. *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Marxsen, Willi. *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel*. Translated by J.Boyce, D. Juel, W. Poehlmann, and R. A. Harrisville. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969.

Matera, Frank J. *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through Their Passion Stories*. New York: Paulist, 1986.

Mauser, Ulrich W. *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and Its Basis in the Biblical Tradition*. Studies in Biblical Theology 39. London: SCM Press, 1963.

Mays, James L. "Prayer and Christology: Psalm 22 as Perspective on the Passion." *Theology Today* 42 (1985): 322-31.

McKinnis, Ray. "Analysis of Mark 10:32-34." *Novum Testamentum* 18 (1976): 81-100.

McKinnon, James W. "On the Question of Psalmody in the Ancient Synagogue." *Early Music History* 6 (1986): 159-91.

Menzies, Allan. *The Earliest Gospel: A Historical Study of the Gospel According to Mark, with a Text and English Version*. New York: Macmillan, 1901.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

Miller, Dale and Patricia. *The Gospel of Mark as Midrash on Earlier Jewish and New Testament Literature*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 21. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1990.

Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.

Morris, Leon. *The Cross in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.

- Moule, C. F. D. *The Origin of Christology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Moyise, Steve. "Intertextuality and the Study of the OT in the NT." Pages 14-41 in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North*. Edited by S. Moyise. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 189. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- , ed. *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- New, David S. *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels, and the Two-Document Hypothesis*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- . "The Genre and Function of the Markan Passion Narrative." *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 153-84.
- . *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Harvard Theological Studies 26. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Noble, Paul R. "Esau, Tamar, and Joseph: Criteria for Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions." *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002): 219-52.
- O'Day, Gail R. "Jeremiah 9:22-23 and 1 Corinthians 1:26-31: A Study in Intertextuality." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 259-67.
- Oesterley, William O. E. *Psalms Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes*. London: SPCK, 1953.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. "The Psalms of Praise in the Worship of the New Testament Church." *Interpretation* 39 (1985): 20-33.

Origen. *Contra Celsum*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Orr, Mary. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity, 2003.

Perri, Carmela. "On Alluding." *Poetics* 7 (1978): 289-307.

Perrin, Norman. *The Resurrection Narratives: A New Approach*. London: SCM Press, 1977.

Perry, John M. "The Three Days in the Synoptic Passion Predictions." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986): 637-54.

Pesch, Rudolph. *Das Markusevangelium: Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27-16,20*. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.

Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Proctor, Mark. "After Three Days" in Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34: Subordinating Jesus' Resurrection in the Second Gospel." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 30 (2003): 399-424.

Puech, Émile. "Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 39 (1988): 38-55.

Reumann, John H. "Psalm 22 at the Cross: Lament and Thanksgiving for Jesus Christ." *Interpretation* 28 (1974): 39-58.

Riffaterre, Michael. *Text Production*. Translated by Terese Lyons. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

Robbins, Vernon K. *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

- . "The Reversed Contextualization of Psalm 22 in the Markan Crucifixion: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis." Pages 1161-1183 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Rohrbaugh, R. L. "The Social Location of the Markan Audience." *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 380-95.
- Roth, Wolfgang. *Hebrew Gospel: Cracking the Code of Mark*. Oak Park, IL: Meyer-Stone Books, 1988.
- Ruppert, Lothar. *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte? Der Weg Jesu im Lichte eines alt- und zwischentestamentlichen Motivs*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 59. Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1972.
- . *Der leidende Gerechte: Eine motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Alten Testament und zwischentestamentlichen Judentum*. Forschung zur Bibel 5. Würzburg, 1972.
- Sabourin, Leopold. "Apocalyptic Traits in Matthew's Gospel." *Religious Studies Bulletin* 3 (1983): 19-36.
- Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1985.
- . *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1977.
- Schaberg, Jane. "Daniel 7,12 and the New Testament Passion-Resurrection Predictions." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 208-22.
- Schaub, Thomas. "Allusion and Intertext: History in *the End of the Road*." Pages 181-203 in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Edited by J. Clayton, and E. Rothstein. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.
- Schmidt, Hans. *Die Psalmen*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1934.
- Schmidt, Karl L. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*. Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919.

- Schmidt, Thomas E. "Cry of Dereliction or Cry of Judgment? Mark 15:34 in Context." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 4 (1994): 145-53.
- Schneck, Richard. *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I-VIII*. Berkeley Institute of Biblical Archaeology and Literature Dissertation Series 1. Vallejo, CA: BIBAL, 1994.
- Schultz, S. "Markus und das Alte Testament." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 58 (1961): 184-97.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *Lordship and Discipleship*. Studies in Biblical Theology 28. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Schwemer, A. E. "Jesu letzte Worte am Kreuz (Mk 15, 34; Lk 23, 46; Joh 19, 28ff)." *Theologische Beiträge* 29 (1998): 5-29.
- Scott, R. B. Y. "The Pillars Jachin and Boaz." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939): 143-9.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 27. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.
- . "Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and Their Adaptation in the New Testament." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 8 (1980): 24-45.
- Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations in the New Testament." Pages 18-27 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by C. A. and J. A. Sanders Evans. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1997.

- Steichele, Hans-Jörg. *Der leidende Sohn Gottes: Eine Untersuchung einiger alttestamentlicher Motive in der Christologie des Markusevangeliums*. Biblische Untersuchungen 14. Regensburg: Pustet, 1980.
- Stendahl, Krister. *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Stipp, Hermann-Josef. "Vier Gestalten einer Totenerweckungserzählung (1 Kön 17,17-24; 2 Kön 4,8-37; Apg 9,36-42; Apg 20,7-12)." *Biblica* 80 (1999): 43-77.
- Stolz, Fritz. "Psalm 22: Alttestamentliches Reden vom Menschen und neutestamentliches Reden von Jesus." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 77 (1980): 129-48.
- Strecker, Georg. "The Passion and Resurrection Predictions in Mark's Gospel." *Interpretation* 22 (1968): 421-42.
- Suhl, Alfred. *Die Funktion der Alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium*. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965.
- Swartley, Willard M. *Israel's Scripture Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels: Story Shaping Story*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Taylor, Vincent. *Jesus and His Sacrifice: A Study of the Passion-Sayings in the Gospels*. London: Macmillan, 1937.
- Telford, William R. *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig-Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and Its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Tertullian, *Apology*. Translated by T. R. Glover. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Thatcher, Tom. "(Re)Mark(S) on the Cross." *Biblical Interpretation* 4 (1996): 346-61.

Theissen, Gerd. *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by L. Maloney. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.

———. "The Parables as Language-Event: Some Comments on Fuchs's Hermeneutics in the Light of Linguistic Philosophy." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 23 (1970): 437-68.

Thompson, Michael. *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1-15.13*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 59. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Tödt, H. E. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by D. M. Barton. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.

Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2d rev. ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

Ulfsgard, Håkan. "The Teacher of Righteousness, the History of the Qumran Community, and Our Understanding of the Jesus Movement: Texts, Theories and Trajectories." Pages 310-46 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by F. H. Cryer, and T. L. Thompson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 290. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Allen Lane Penguin, 1997.

———. "The Use of *בר נשא בר נשא* in Jewish Aramaic." Pages 310-28 in *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Edited by M. Black. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

Voelz, James W. "Multiple Signs, Levels of Meaning and Self as Text: Elements of Intertextuality." *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 149-164.

- Vorster, Willem S. "The Function of the Use of the Old Testament in Mark." *Neotestamentica* 14 (1981): 62-72.
- . "Intertextuality and Redaktionsgeschichte." Pages 15-26 in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel*. Edited by S. Draisma. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1989.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. "The Righteous Teacher in the Pesharite Commentaries." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 73 (2002): 1-27.
- Watson, Francis. "The Social Function of Mark's Secrecy Theme." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 24 (1985): 49-69.
- . "Why Was Jesus Crucified?" *Theology* 88 (1985): 105-112.
- Watts, Rikki E. *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 88. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1997.
- . "The Psalms in Mark's Gospel." Pages 25-45 in *The Psalms in the New Testament*. Edited by S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken. London: T & T Clark International, a Continuum imprint, 2004.
- White, John L. "Beware the Leavened Bread: Markan Imager in the Last Supper." *Forum* 3 (1987): 49-63.
- . "The Way of the Cross: Was There a Pre-Markan Passion Narrative?." *Forum* 3 (1987): 35-49.
- Williams, Gary R. "Frustrated Expectations in Isaiah V 1-7: A Literary Interpretation." *Vetus Testamentum* 35 (1985): 459-65.
- Williams, P. J. "The Linguistic Background to Jesus' Dereliction Cry (Matthew 27:46; Mark 15:34)." Pages 1-12 in *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background in Honour of B. W. Winter on His 65th Birthday*. Edited by P. J. Williams, A. D. Clarke, P. M. Head, and D. Instone-Brewer. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Wimsatt, W. K. and Monroe C. Beardsley. "The Intentional Fallacy." Pages 3-18 in *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1954.

Witherup, Ronald D. "The Death of Jesus and the Raising of the Saints: Matthew 27:51-54 in Context." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 26 (1987): 574-85.

Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 2. London: SPCK, 1996.

Young, Franklin W. "A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 46 (1955): 215-33.